The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, MARCH 11, 1886.

The Week.

THE Republican Senators showed their true character again last week by confirming without dissent the appointment of Mr. Hedden to the Collectorship of this port. Both New York Senators, Evarts and Miller, urged his confirmation. In view of the Republican outcry against Mr. Hedden at the time of his appointment, and the grave reasons for questioning his fitness for the position which his conduct in the appointment of Sterling gave rise to, there was ample ground for a Republican Senate, devoted solely to the public good, to make a "fight" on his nomination. But they confirmed it, as they confirmed that of the disgracefully unfit Rasin, without hesitation. The meaning of their action is plain enough. They know that their confirmation of a bad appointment does not remove from the President one particle of the responsibility for making it. They are not using their confirming powers to keep unfit men out of the service, but are trying to use them to gain a petty partisan advantage of the President. If they could force him to do all that they wish, they would still refuse to share any of the responsibility for those very acts in which they demand a right to participate.

We print elsewhere a suggestion from a well-informed correspondent, that the true remedy for Senatorial irresponsibility in the matter of suspensions and removals is to have the vote on nominations public, while keeping the discussion of them secret as at present. His main argument in favor of this is, that sensitive men would shrink from having their character openly canvassed by critics who, in many cases, would be hostile or malicious. He thinks that through the open vote "the responsibility of Senators for unfit confirmations would be ascertained, and all bargaining for confirmations and for the division and control of patronage could easily be detected, and would be remorselessly exposed. If Mr. Senator —— secured the confirmation of a characterless politician whose nomination he had procured, the open vote would show from whom he got his support." It would, if the vote were taken by yeas and nays, show from whom he got his support; but it would not show that he was a characterless politician. Our correspondent's plan might possibly work if there were no four years' term and everybody held office during good behavior, so that appointments were few and far between. As things now are, it would be futile. What is needed to fix responsibility, both on the President and Senate, is more knowledge of the vast swarm of new men they select for office in each Presidential term. This the public does not now possess and has no means of getting. It therefore does not know in most cases when the Senate confirms a man, whether it confirms him because he is a great rascal or because he is a model of all the virtues. One is nearly as likely as the other, and in no way can it get this knowledge except from open discussion of the candidates' qualifications.

Mr. Edmunds's discussion of the dispute between the Senate and the President about the official papers was no doubt able, but it was what is called "academical"—that is, has not and cannot have any practical end in view. Nothing can come of it, because the Senate is unable to tell the public what it would do with the papers if it got them. If the Senate could say it was going to use them in order to see that the President put none but good men in office, and turned none but bad men out of office, it would rouse public interest and expectation to the highest degree. But there is no pretence even that it has any such end in view. There is no pretence that it would not, after getting "the papers," confirm as many bad nominations as the President chooses to send in. This is all very unfortunate because Americans are a practical people, and care very little about contests over barren rights, and care very little who has "papers" which are of no value to anybody—not even to the owner.

The daily hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on the new tariff bill are very impressive. Every group of producers wants a little more tariff, and generally wants it in the interest of labor. Occasionally Mr. Hewitt brings a blush to the cheeks of these sturdy beggars by asking them whether they are in the habit of paying higher wages when they get higher prices for their products, and whether they employ newly-arrived Hungarian and Italian laborers when they have difficulties with the Knights, etc., etc. But seldom does anybody appear before the Committee to represent the fifty or sixty million consumers of the articles taxed. On Monday the rice-growers had their day in court. They were represented by Mr. Trenholm, of South Carolina, who avowed himself a free-trader in principle, but insisted that if protection was the "going thing" the rice-growers ought to be protected against the pauper labor of the East Indies, and especially against the deleterious practice that has grown up in this country of entering broken rice under the head of "granulated" at 20 per cent. duty. The brewers, who use this broken rice, were represented at the hearing, and they made a vigorous protest against any increase in the duty or change in the classification. And so it goes on from day to day, showing how the law is invoked on this side and that to take money from one class or calling and give it to another. The Knights of Labor may be trusted to keep a close watch and make notes on the proceedings, to be used when it comes their turn to make the laws and divide up the national earnings according to everybody's deserts.

A fresh illustration of the ingeniously bad effect of our revenue laws upon the commerce of the country was afforded by the recent arguments of a committee of merchants of this city before the Ways and Means Committee at Washington, in the discussion of Mr. Hewitt's bill, by which it is proposed to amend sections 2970 and 2983 of the Revised Statutes. The proposed amendment allows merchandise to remain in bonded warehouses for three years, instead of only for one year, as at present, and provides that the duties shall be assessed on the *quantity* withdrawn. The depreciation in quantity or weight of some goods, and particularly of sugar, on storage, is very great, but under the existing revenue laws the duty must be paid on the weight which went into store—in other words, duty must be paid on something which does not exist. The evil worked by such a state of the laws is that comparatively very little unrefined sugar is kept in store here, merchants preferring to find warehouses for it in some foreign port. It would seem to be enough to require importers to pay duty on what they possess, without placing a tax on their losses. Such a law, in fact, drives commerce from our doors. By lengthening the time allowed for goods to remain in bond our warehouses and insurance companies will be benefited, and the increased quantity of goods on storage will make a more stable market price.

The last number of *Bradstreet's* continues the narrative of the great struggle over the tariff on dirt. Pursuing their appeal to the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Messrs. Newlin and Sanders, representing the American Wool Growers' Association, put in a brief representing that washed wool is the article as it comes from the sheep's back, after the animal has been soused in the river, and before the fleece has received any cleansing with hot water. Hot water "starts the grease," and that is the very thing that the tariff was intended to prevent. It was shown by incontestable evidence that, after the grease was started, the Donskoi wool was "taken to a raft and beaten with sticks to loosen the dung-balls and other impurities," and that after this fraudulent treatment it was "again put into the river and then hung up to dry in the sun." This, Messrs. Newlin and Saunders contend, "is confessedly not washed wool." It is more than washed, and must therefore be classed as scoured, and taxed 7½ cents per pound. The Donskoi wool men, on the other hand, insisted that scoured wool was an article which had been treated with soap, or chemicals, or machinery, and that merely "starting the grease" could not be considered scouring. Testimony was introduced to show that American wools were classed as washed, tub-washed, and scoured—washed wool being the article as partially cleansed on the sheep's back, tub-washed being treated with hot water in order to start the grease, and scoured being treated with chemicals. The weight of testimony seems to be strongly against the position taken by the American Wool Growers' Association.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Upon the whole, it seems to be necessary to have more stringent legislation to secure an adequate importation of dirt. If anybody had anticipated the practice now disclosed as of daily occurrence in the valley of the Don of starting the grease and loosening the impurities before shipping wool to this country, stringent measures would have been taken to prevent such frauds.

The great strike on the "Gould Southwestern system" began in the Texas Pacific, a bankrupt concern, which is in the hands of a receiver—that is, in the care and custody of the courts of the United States. It has extended to the other Gould roads, but whether there were grievances on those other roads or whether the extension of the strike was in the nature of a boycott, we are unable to discover. At first the strike on the Texas Pacific was supposed to have some relation to the Mallory boycott at Galveston, but the connection between the two is not plain. What is clear is that 9,000 or 10,000 men have voluntarily ceased work, that 6,000 miles of railway are idle, and that all traffic except the carrying of the mails is suspended in the country served by these roads. Of course, such a condition of things cannot last. The men who have thrown themselves out of work cannot subsist long without wages. The treasury of the Knights of Labor cannot stand such a drain. On the other hand, steps must be taken to put the trains in motion either by employing other hands or by acceding to the demands of the strikers. Mr. Hoxie, the General Manager of the Gould Southwestern System, is a man of much resolution, and is weather-beaten in all sorts of rough-and-tumble work on the frontier. If he is allowed to have his way, he will probably fight the strike to the bitter end. A sufficient number of men can be collected to take the places of the strikers if they can be protected in the performance of their work. Whether they can be protected will depend much upon the state of public opinion along the lines affected, and this again will depend much upon the causes of the strike, which are as yet very indistinct.

So great an upheaval of labor difficulties would naturally produce quakings all over the country. The most significant echo of all perhaps is that which comes from the interior of Illinois, where the local assembly of the Knights of Labor have resolved to form a separate National Labor Party and have done with the old parties altogether. This, we think, is greatly to be desired. The awful spectacle now presented to us of Republican and Democratic newspapers, like the *Tribune* and *Sun* of this city, tumbling over each other in their haste to endorse everything that is denominated labor, and to support any kind of outlawry if it bears the brand of a trade union, would be speedily withdrawn if the Knights and their affiliated societies should form a party of their own. It is the logic of their position that they should do so. What they are aiming at is to govern the country, and this they can never do until they become a political party, for, under existing conditions, neither party will do all that they ask. Both will cheat them more or less.

The passage of the Blair Education Bill by a large majority in the Senate, and the favorable report in the House on the Eads Mexican Ship Railway Bill, the growing rage for pensions, and the continued purchase and coinage of silver at the rate of $2,000,000 per month—all these things coming upon the Treasury without any tax bill to provide the means for them—suggest the inquiry whether the Knights of Labor, if vested with supreme legislative powers, could do anything worse. They could do no worse than empty the Treasury, destroy the public credit, and produce national bankruptcy, temporary or permanent. This is the drift of things at Washington now, and the main reliance of the public against these evils rests in the Executive veto, and in the hope that something more than one-third of the members of one or the other house may sustain the veto power when it comes to be exercised.

The bloody-shirt organs at the North are just well started on a chorus of indignant outcries against a "Confederate Brigadier" from Kentucky, Wolford by name, who has announced his purpose to introduce in Congress a bill giving to every Confederate soldier who lost a leg or arm in the war an artificial leg or arm at the expense of the Government. It seems a pity to spoil the fun of the organs, but regard for truth compels us to state that General Wolford served with distinction in the Union army as Colonel of the First Kentucky Cavalry, and fought gallantly to put down the rebellion. Besides, the bloody-shirt organs ought not to forget that assistance from the Treasury to disabled Confederates is good Republican doctrine now, since the Republican party in Virginia last year declared in favor of pensions for ex-rebel soldiers, and the chief Republican organ in Virginia appealed for popular support on the ground that the Democrats could not be trusted to make appropriations for this purpose.

We are glad to see that the Southern Congressmen have learned the true way to dispose of the bloody-shirt shriekers, which is simply to make fun of them. Mr. Norwood, of Georgia, last week applied this process to Mr. Henderson, of Iowa, who had discharged a lot of rant against his countrymen in the South, and he set the whole House laughing at that victim of "a disease common to public men, known ordinarily as '*vox populi*' on the diaphragm, but, when it becomes acute, called cerebro elephantiasis." Mr. Breckinridge, of Kentucky, followed Mr. Norwood's humorous disposition of the bloody-shirt clap-trap with a serious exposure of the demagogy which seeks popularity by supporting huge pension jobs, putting the case with admirable force when he plainly told the House that, in increasing the pensions of widows and orphans of soldiers, it ought not to forget that every dollar appropriated for public purposes was taken from the people by the tax-gatherer; that every dollar was coined in the sweat of labor; that there could not be any such thing as the surplus that was so much talked about when finances were discussed, so long as every city and town in the country was burdened with debt; and that in adding 50 per cent. to the pensions of widows and orphans of soldiers, just so much must be taken from all the widows and orphans who do not benefit by the bill. Between Mr. Norwood's raillery and Mr. Breckinridge's seriousness the Northern demagogues were pretty thoroughly exposed.

In view of the recent reductions in postal rates, it is a surprise to find that Senator Wilson, of Iowa, has introduced a bill doubling the postal charge on "fourth-class matter" after the first of July next. This class covers what may be termed miscellaneous mail matter, consisting mostly of small samples of dry goods, seeds, plants, bulbs, and scions. The present postal charge is one cent an ounce, and the cheap and efficient delivery of packages through the mail has been a great boon, especially to the scattered population of farmers, florists, and agriculturists generally throughout the country, the practice of using the mail for such articles having grown largely within the past few years. The apparent reason for this is, that in the first place it is cheaper than to send by express, and in the second place the express offices are fewer, and often at much greater distance from the farmer or country resident, than the post-offices. It is very probable that the express companies feel that this use of the mails is taking away a part of what they consider their business, and it is intimated that these companies are endeavoring to promote the proposed change in the law. It is almost superfluous to urge that no change for the benefit of private corporations should be allowed in our postal laws, which exist for the greatest good of the greatest number of citizens. Without complete statistics of the mail service throughout the whole country, it is difficult to say what proportion the postage received on fourth-class matter bears to the cost of transportation. If on careful investigation it should appear that the mails are used for transporting ordinary merchandise at a considerable loss to the revenue, it would be easy to modify the law by way of making rational distinctions without doubling the rate on all "fourth-class matter."

The appointment of Col. William Ludlow, of the United States Army, as Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, is a pointed rebuke by the Democratic President to the Republican City Council of Philadelphia. Colonel Ludlow is the officer who has been for three years past the Chief Engineer of the Philadelphia Water Department, having secured leave of absence from the army without pay, in 1883, to fill that position, and who was recently refused a reëlection by the Republican Councilmen, nominally because he is personally a Democrat in political faith, but really, as the leading Republican organ of the city was forced to confess, because he had kept politics entirely out of the department,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and had administered it "strictly on business principles." What is Philadelphia's loss, through the openly avowed purpose of the Republican ring to get rid of a good officer, in the words of the *Press*, "because he *is* a good officer," and because the spoilsmen were resolved to substitute a man who would give them "the cake" of patronage, is thus Washington's gain, thanks to Mr. Cleveland.

The Western Union Telegraph Company has submitted to the inevitable, and has paid without further protest the $135,000 of tax still due the State for the year 1881. It will be remembered that when the law of 1881 was passed, taxing the entire capital stock of all corporations, the Western Union raised the point that only a part of its entire capital was employed or situated in New York, that it paid heavy taxes to other States on its property situated therein, and that it could not in justice be asked to pay to New York a tax on more than that portion of its capital represented by property within the State. In 1885 the Legislature recognized the justice of this plea by amending the law of 1881 so as to tax only the property within the State for 1882, 1883, and 1884, and thereafter, but did not include the year 1881. This was an obvious injustice, because if it was not right to assess the tax on the entire capital for those years, it was not right so to assess it for 1881. The Western Union carried its plea against paying on the entire capital in 1881 to the Court of Appeals, but the Court decided that the law must be obeyed. The Comptroller had no other course to follow than to obey the law, and he has been pressing the company rigorously for payment. He has induced the Legislature to pass an amendment to the Code of Civil Procedure, enabling him to collect tax-money from a corporation precisely as he would from an individual, and this has been signed by the Governor. When the Western Union heard of the Governor's signature it gave up the struggle and paid the money. Nevertheless, the company has been in the right in the controversy, and we cannot regard the success of the State in the matter as anything less than a triumph of injustice for which the Legislature of 1885 is solely responsible.

The chapter of history furnished by General H. V. Boynton to the Cincinnati *Commercial Gazette* on the origin and meaning of the Sherman-Johnston Convention of April, 1865, is, we think, entirely new, and is certainly important. General Boynton has had much to do with the controversies of the war period, and has never, we believe, stated anything as a fact which did not turn out to be such. He says that the idea of arranging terms for the final surrender of the Confederate armies which should lay the foundation for a conservative reaction, was conceived by Montgomery Blair, and by him communicated to the leading officers of General Sherman's army. General Frank P. Blair was one of these officers, and he would naturally have been the medium of communication if there was such a political scheme on foot. The idea, General Boynton says, was approved by some of these officers and disapproved by others, and was accepted by General Sherman himself and embodied in the terms of the surrender of Johnston's army, which included in its scope all the remaining armed forces of the Confederacy. This is a rational explanation of that mysterious affair—mysterious because it was an attempt on the part of a subordinate officer to make terms different from those fixed in a parallel case by his chief. The affair ceases to be a mystery if we assume that General Boynton's account of it is correct, viz.: that it was the culmination of a political plot originating outside of the army to reconstruct the Union on what was called a "conservative basis." If this is the correct history of the affair, the checkmate given to it by Secretary Stanton was none too prompt or vigorous.

The series of letters that passed between Generals Grant and Halleck during the war, furnished by General Boynton to the *North American Review*, put a new face on the actual relations between those officers, and turn into consummate foolishness the efforts of certain persons to make out a state of suspicion, jealousy, mistrust, and hostility between them. More than this, they obviously leave something to be explained regarding the tone of the first volume of General Grant's Memoirs toward General Halleck. This tone is expressive not so much of hostility toward Halleck as of contempt for his judgment—a contempt which General Grant certainly did not entertain either at the time when Halleck was Grant's commanding officer, or when their positions were reversed. If General Grant had left no personal memoirs, but somebody else had written the book which bears his name, it would be easy to prove from these letters that General Halleck had been hardly dealt with. Much as we cherish General Grant's memory, we are bound to set the truth on a higher pinnacle than any man's impressions and recollections of long-past events.

The most curious thing about the Holland trial was not so much his acquittal as his high standing in his own State, Texas. He had in court a great bundle of testimonials from leading citizens of that community, all of which the Court refused to have read, but one from the Governor was read. One gets from them a very odd impression of Texan society even now. We should have supposed that a man starting from Texas, in order to bilk a dealer in counterfeit money in New York, and to kill him if necessary in the attempt, would have had to go back fifty years at least in order to carry with him in his enterprise the loving admiration and anxiety of his brother Texans. But it seems that even now, in 1886, he is a hero in the eyes of his fellow-citizens, and they are looking for his return with tear-dimmed eyes. The Legislature will probably take notice of it when he comes. He may become a lecturer with diagrams.

The Catholics have begun, in a somewhat promising way, the foundation of a Catholic university. They want $800,000 and they have got $600,000, and the balance seems to be within reach. The object is, as explained by Bishop Kean, at a meeting held last Thursday, to supply Catholic youth with a higher education, without exposing them to the scepticism with which all the existing universities are infected. "The universities and secular colleges," he said, "were turning out accomplished scholars who were tainted with unbelief." "There was no institution for the highest learning," he added, "either in England or in this country, where a Catholic young man could receive an education without danger to that priceless treasure, his faith." There are doubtless a good many strong reasons why Catholics should have a university of their own, but surely the failure of all denominational colleges thus far to save their students from the agnostic infection—a failure which Bishop Kean himself points out—ought to make people hesitate about starting another as a bulwark of faith. The Catholic universities on the European Continent have not prevented the bulk of the young men from becoming sceptics; why should an American university fare any better? No university will ever succeed, or has ever succeeded, in implanting in young men's minds ideas about the unseen world which are sure to last. In truth, it is, judging from experience, questionable whether universities under theological management are not more dangerous to faith than secular ones, for the simple reason that the very attempt to furnish a young man under twenty-one with a fixed set of opinions on subjects not capable of scientific treatment, is very apt to produce a reaction on his first exposure to unfavorable influences.

The queer errors into which even historians and literary men, and professed publicists, like Mr. Froude, sometimes fall in very simple matters, is well illustrated in an interview with him which the *Herald* prints. He is all for stern *action* against the Irish (politicians of his school are generally "sick of mere talk"); but what he wants in the meantime is something American in the treatment of Ireland. "Look," says he, "at what the Supreme Court did at Washington the other day. It ordered Virginia to pay her debts in an honest way." We have no doubt that he really believes that this is what happened, and that the Supreme Court has power to order State Legislatures to vote money for specific purposes, and thinks that a similar tribunal, if one could be set up in England, might keep the Irish Parliament in order. Another gem of misinformation is to be found in the sentence: "If Ireland were governed as the South was governed by the North after your civil war, with a firm and steady hand, there would be peace, and then any industry and prosperity there might be would have an opportunity of emerging and of telling on the condition of the country, and there would be no opposition." As a description of the carpet-bag period of reconstruction at the South, this is of course very amusing. This talk is worth reproducing as an illustration of the equipment, both intellectual and moral, of a considerable number of Englishmen whose dogmatizing about Ireland has an important share in forming the opinion by which that unhappy country has been so long governed.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUMMARY OF THE WEEK'S NEWS.

[WEDNESDAY, March 3, to TUESDAY, March 9, 1886, inclusive.]

DOMESTIC.

THE Senate on Wednesday confirmed the nomination of Collector Hedden. In the debate on the Blair Education Bill the following amendment by Mr. Edmunds was adopted: "And in each State and Territory in which there shall be separate schools for white and colored children, the money paid in such State and Territory shall be apportioned and paid out for the support of such white and colored schools, respectively, in the proportion that the white and colored children between the ages of ten and twenty-one years in such State or Territory bear to each other, as shown by the census of 1880. The foregoing provision shall not affect the application of the proper proportion of said money to the support of all common schools wherein no distinction of race or color shall exist."

In the Senate on Thursday Mr. Logan's amendment to the Education Bill, increasing the appropriation to $136,000,000, was lost; yeas 12, nays 30. Mr. Logan then moved another amendment, appropriating $2,000,000 to aid in building school-houses in communities of sparse population, among people who would find it comparatively difficult to erect school-houses. This was adopted.

The Senate passed the Blair Education Bill on Friday by a vote of 36 to 11, the nays being Coke and Cockrell (Dems., Tex.), Gray (Dem., Del.), Harris (Dem., Tenn.), Maxey (Dem., Tex.), Wilson (Dem., Md.), Frye, Hale, Ingalls, Jones, and Plumb (Reps.). The House, by a vote of 229 to 20, passed a deficiency bill appropriating $634,452 to meet unforeseen expenditures.

The bill reported by Senator Van Wyck to provide for the taxation of railroad-grant lands provides that no such lands shall be exempt from local taxation by States, Territories, and other municipal corporations on account of the lien of the United States thereon for the cost of surveying, etc., or because no patent has been issued therefor.

The House Committee on Commerce on Friday agreed, by a vote of 9 to 4, to report favorably with amendments the Reagan Inter-State Commerce Bill.

The House Committee on Naval Affairs has completed a report, which says: "It is the unanimous opinion of your Committee that the Government of the United States ought not longer to permit the lives and property of American citizens to be thus manifestly held at the mercy of so many foreign nations. Forts of iron and steel cannot, within any reasonable limit of cost, be erected so as to give protection wherever it is needed. This it is only practicable to do by means of a navy which can follow an enemy to every point of attack."

There are reports that there is to be considerable opposition in the Ways and Means Committee to the Morrison Tariff Bill. The Republican members of the Committee think that the Democrats on the Committee will not sustain Mr. Morrison, and that the bill will be very much altered before it is reported.

Speaker Carlisle has announced as the Special Committee "to investigate the facts concerning the ownership of Pan-Electric telephone stock by certain public officers": Messrs. Boyle of Pennsylvania, Oates of Alabama, Eden of Illinois, Hall of Iowa, Hale of Missouri, Millard of New York (Dems.), and Hanback of Kansas, Moffat of Michigan, and Ranney of Massachusetts (Reps.). The House on Thursday passed the Pension Appropriation Bill.

Secretary Whitney has sent to the House the reply of Commodore Truxtun, commandant at the Norfolk Navy-yard, to Mr. Boutelle's resolution of January 22, alleging the obliteration of honorable inscriptions from cannon and from the dry dock at Norfolk, and the unnecessary and partisan discharge of employees. As to the inscriptions on guns, said to have been purposely destroyed, he replies that none were destroyed by his order, while some inscriptions that had been partly obliterated by exposure were renewed by his order in June last. The dry dock was never destroyed. "The officers in charge of this yard," he says, "having all been engaged upon the side of the Union in the war, have in no way discriminated against Union sailors and soldiers. All their sympathies are with them, and all the rights and benefits belonging to them by law and from their services to their country have been carefully guarded and freely given to them. I think there are more Union soldiers and sailors employed in this yard to-day than there were on the day the present Administration came into power."

The death of Senator Miller makes vacant the Chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Some of the friends of Mr. Sherman, who is the acting Chairman of the Committee, say that he would resign the office of President pro tempore of the Senate to be made Chairman of that Committee. Mr. Sherman has never been satisfied with his committee positions since he returned to the Senate after having been Secretary of the Treasury.

President Cleveland on Thursday nominated James C. Matthews, of Albany, N. Y., to be Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia, to succeed Frederick Douglass. Mr. Matthews is a well-known colored lawyer and a Democrat. He won prizes in an Albany school for boys, and was graduated with honor from the Albany Law School.

The President on Monday appointed Major William Ludlow, of the Corps of Engineers, U. S. A., to be Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, vice-Major Garrett J. Lydecker. Mr. Ludlow has an excellent record as an engineer officer, and has had charge of important public improvements in various parts of the country.

The President has not been able to find a suitable person to fill the position of Civil-Service Commissioner to succeed Mr. Eaton. He finds it difficult to induce a competent person to accept the place for the salary.

Brigadier-General A. H. Terry, who stormed Fort Fisher, has been promoted to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Major-General Hancock.

A great strike of 10,000 Knights of Labor on the Gould system of railroads in the Southwest was ordered on Saturday. It grew out of the Mallory boycott at Galveston. Freight traffic is entirely suspended.

The action of the Knights of Labor of the Decatur, Ill., section in forming a new political party is attracting much attention. They declare in their platform, "We have formed a new national political party, to be known as the United Labor Party of America, for the purpose of organizing and directing the great political power of the industrial masses as a political organization; and we will cast our ballots for no one who will not pledge himself to stand firmly by our principles."

Master Workman Powderly, upon being shown the statement that the Knights of Labor of Illinois had formed a political party under the auspices of the order, declared it untrue, and said that if such a thing is attempted by any district or local or State Assembly of the Knights of Labor, the charter of the body taking such action will be recalled. The order cannot be turned into a political party.

A prominent member of the Knights of Labor in Washington says that this order is making arrangements to organize the police forces of cities into branches of their society. He claimed that there was nothing improper in this, as policemen were only wage-workers like laborers and mechanics. He also expressed his confidence that the scheme would be carried out successfully.

An extensive strike of the coal miners of Federation No. 3, comprising the soft coal districts of the East, was begun on Monday for the uniform scale of wages which was adopted at the Convention at Cumberland, Md., of February 19. About 10,000 men quit work, 5,000 of whom were in Maryland mines.

All the street-car lines in this city and several in Brooklyn stopped running cars on Friday morning, owing to the refusal of certain companies to yield the demands of their employees. The difficulty was finally referred to Railroad Commissioner O'Donnell, and the cars started at two o'clock in the afternoon.

The New York Senate Committee on Railroads, which has been investigating the Broadway Railroad affair in this city, made a preliminary report on Tuesday. After reviewing the circumstances surrounding the grant of the franchise by the Aldermen, the report says: "Of the means which procured this action on the part of the Aldermen, your Committee have but one opinion, and that opinion is that it was done by bribery and corruption. In every avenue leading up to this conspiracy are seen the footprints of fraud and deception—in the appointment and proceedings of the commissioners who authorized the location and construction of the road; in the dealings with the agents and attorneys of the taxpayers, who conscientiously sought to defeat the project or secure justice to the city; and in the concealments and deceptions practised upon the trustees of the mortgages put upon the property, like that which secured the name of President Palmer, of the Broadway Bank, to the second-mortgage bonds of the company in ignorance of the fact that already a prior mortgage of $1,500,000 had been placed upon the property. All progress was made by unusual and secret methods unknown to legitimate business. It is unpleasant to know, and painful to relate, that commissioners appointed by the court to determine upon the right to build the road are not entirely free from suspicion. The city lost a property which the evidence adduced before the Committee shows would yield a net interest of 5 per cent. on $10,000,000. The results of this successful brigandage, if allowed to go unchallenged, are far-reaching and productive of danger—first, to the city and its taxpayers, and second; and not much more remotely, to honest government and social progress." The report was accompanied with a report recommending the passage of four bills: the first annuls the charter of the Broadway Surface Railroad Co.; the second provides legal machinery to wind up corporations dissolved by the Legislature; the third provides that no local authorities shall have power to pass a street-railroad franchise over a Mayor's veto without the consent of one-half the property-owners on the street affected; the fourth bill provides that the repeal of the franchise to a street-railroad corporation shall not act as the annulment of the franchise, but simply of the corporation. The franchise shall be sold at public auction to the highest bidder.

The Civil-Service Reform Association of this city has passed resolutions favoring "the abandonment by the Senate of the United States and by the State Senates of the practice of discussing and acting upon nominations for office in secret session"; also, "the enactment of laws making it the duty of public officers intrusted with the power of appointment and removal to put upon public record in every case of suspension or of removal the reasons therefor, or, in the absence of such legislation, the introduction of the practice of regularly recording the reasons for the suspensions or removals made." The Association furthermore has declared in favor of a law prohibiting members of Congress from taking part in solicitations for public office.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Massachusetts Reform Club (of Independents), at its dinner in Boston on Thursday night, sent the following despatch to President Cleveland: "The Massachusetts Reform Club, assembled on this the anniversary of your inauguration, congratulate you upon the success of your Administration, and desire to express their warm appreciation of your courageous efforts for reform and better government for the people."

The Harvard Conference Committee has adopted a recommendation of Professor C. C. Langdell, the Dean of the Law School, that the members of the Senior Class be allowed to take one of the regular courses in the Law School, and have this counted as a quarter of their last year's work for the degree of A. B. The Faculty has to pass on this.

The sale of 240 paintings belonging to the collection of the late Mrs. Mary J. Morgan was held in this city during the week. The aggregate realized was $885,300.

Mrs. Harriet Ward Foote, wife of Senator Joseph R. Hawley, of Connecticut, died in Washington on Wednesday evening. Mrs. Hawley spent three years during the war in the military hospitals, nursing the patients and teaching the art of nursing to others.

The widow ot ex-Governor Horatio Seymour died in Utica on Monday. She was a daughter of John R. Bleecker, of Albany.

United States Senator John P. Miller, of California, died in Washington on Monday, in his fifty-third year. His term would have expired in 1887.

Mrs. Benjamin Harris Brewster, wife of ex-Attorney-General Brewster, died in Philadelphia on Tuesday. Mrs. Brewster was the daughter of Robert J. Walker, at one time Secretary of the Treasury.

Ex-Senator Jerome B. Chaffee, of Colorado, died near this city on Tuesday aged sixty-one. He had amassed a large fortune, part of which was swallowed up in the Grant & Ward failure.

Colonel William S. Clark died in Amherst, Mass., on Tuesday, at the age of sixty. He was graduated at Amher t College and received the degree of Ph.D. at Göttingen. During the war he was Major and Colonel of the Twenty-first Massachusetts regiment. Later he was Professor of Chemistry and President of the Amherst Agricultural College. He resigned in 1879. In 1877 he organized an agricultural college in Japan. A few years ago he engaged in mining enterprises which were disastrous.

FOREIGN.

Lord Salisbury, speaking at a Conservative banquet in London on Wednesday night, denied the assertion of Sir Henry James that he had ever encouraged the "home-rule delusion" in the slightest manner.

The Parnellites on Thursday decided to array themselves against the Tories in their attempt to force the Government to show their hand on their policy during the debate on the civil-service estimates. The Conservatives had arranged to have Mr. Hugh Holmes, Conservative member for Dublin University and lately Attorney-General for Ireland, interrupt the Government's proposition to go into Committee on the Civil-Service Estimates, by an amendment declaring that the House was unwilling to entertain estimates for the civil establishments in Ireland, before being placed in possession of the policy which the Government intended to pursue for the "restoration and maintenance of social order in the country." It was calculated that if this amendment was carried, the Government would be either blocked or compelled to divulge their intentions. Mr. Parnell, however, resolved to go to Mr. Gladstone's rescue.

In the House of Commons on Thursday afternoon Mr. Holmes offered the amendment about the Government's Irish policy of which notice had been given. Mr. Gladstone chaffingly declined to fall into the trap set for him. He said that he was not such a simpleton as to yield to the artful allurements of his opponents. He had already stated that the Government was considering the question of social order in Ireland, the land question, and the question of the future government of Ireland. These subjects were inextricably associated. The Government was really entitled to three months' time for the preparation of Irish measures. Referring to sneering allusions to Mr. Davitt's and the League's denunciation of outrages, Mr. Gladstone said he was glad to hear that Mr. Davitt was preaching order, and delighted that the League was mending its manners. Lord Randolph Churchill justified the motion on the ground that there was danger that Mr. Gladstone would lull the country to torpor. A motion to adjourn the debate was rejected by a vote of 364 to 160. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach remarked that in view of the silence of the Ministers the Conservatives were satisfied with the result of the protest that had been made, and would not call for a division. The Parnellites express themselves as highly satisfied with Mr. Gladstone's speech. It was authoritatively announced on Friday that Mr. Gladstone had neither directly nor indirectly consulted with Mr. Parnell on the subject of home-rule for Ireland.

In the House of Commons on Friday evening Mr. Labouchere's motion, that a hereditary chamber of legislation "is inconsistent with the principles of representative government," was rejected by a vote of 202 to 166, the Radicals and Parnellites forming the minority. Many Liberals abstained from voting. The majority was mainly Conservatives and prominent members of the Government.

In the House of Commons on Tuesday evening Mr. Dillwyn (Liberal) moved to disestablish the Church of Wales. Mr. Grey (Liberal) moved to reform instead of to disestablish the Church of Wales. Mr. Grey's amendment was first adopted by a vote of 241 to 229, and then, as a substitute for Mr. Dillwyn's motion, was rejected by a vote of 346 to 49. In the first division the minority consisted of Liberals and Parnellites. In the second division the Parnellites left the House in a body. Messrs. Gladstone, Chamberlain, Morley, and Trevelyan abstained from voting altogether.

Mr. John Morley, Chief Secretary for Ireland, announced in the House of Commons on Monday afternoon that an agent had started for the islands on the western coast of Ireland with a little money and a quantity of seed potatoes. He added that the Government would take other measures to relieve the distress, which, he said, was "terrible."

Mr. Gladstone has made such progress with the landlords' expropriation scheme as to require the services of Sir Henry Thring, the Parliamentary Counsel to the Government, to draft the details of the bill. He proposes an ascending scale of rates of purchase on the ratio of the extent and value of tenants' holdings. It was announced on Monday that Mr. Gladstone was suffering from a severe cold. He is recovering.

Lord Hartington, in a speech in London on Friday evening, insisted that it was necessary to obtain a clear statement of the Irish demands, and an assurance that any proposal by the responsible Government would be accepted by Mr. Parnell and his followers on the authority of the Irish people.

Earl Rosebery, Foreign Secretary, has instructed Sir Henry Drummond Wolff, the British Commissioner in Egypt, to reject the demand of Mukhtar Pasha, the Turkish Commissioner, that an Egyptian army be organized with a large Turkish element. The English occupation of Egypt will continue until the questions of the fellaheen's tenure of land and civil, military, and financial reforms have been settled.

Mr. Charles Russell, the British Attorney-General, went to Buckingham Palace on Friday to be knighted. After waiting an hour he received word from the Queen that she was fatigued by the duties of the "drawing-room" and must postpone the ceremony of knighting him. Mr. Russell withdrew from the palace in indignation. He was knighted, however, on Monday. It is believed that the Queen is irritated at his pronounced home-rule views.

Eight men who have been convicted of taking prominent part in the recent Trafalgar Square and Hyde Park riots, London, were on Friday sentenced at the Middlesex Sessions to penal servitude for terms ranging from one to five years.

In the French Chamber of Deputies on Thursday afternoon, amid great excitement, a motion for the immediate expulsion of the French princes from France was made and vigorously supported by M. Clémenceau and opposed by Prime Minister de Freycinet. The motion was rejected by 345 to 176. A vote of confidence in the Government was adopted by 353 to 112.

M. de Freycinet, it is reported, has demanded an explanation from the Belgian Government as to why the latter did not send a commission to meet the French Commission and delimit the boundary line between the Congo State and French territory. Negotiations for a Congo loan have been broken off in Paris.

Louise Michel and a companion were pelted with stones and snowballs at Versailles on Monday evening while addressing a meeting on socialism.

M. de Lesseps and party sailed on Wednesday from Colon for France.

The Paris *Gaulois* states that a serious difference of opinion between France and China has arrested the progress of the negotiations for a settlement of the Tonquin frontier question and the establishment of a commercial treaty between the two countries.

Rumelia has agreed to abolish duties on goods which have already paid a customs tax on entering Turkey. Objection to this Rumelian duty was the reason assigned by France for withholding her adherence to the Turco-Bulgarian treaty appointing Prince Alexander military ruler of Eastern Rumelia.

All the Powers have given their assent to the Rumelian agreement as modified by Russia. The clause relating to a military alliance between Bulgaria and Turkey has been eliminated.

Greece continues her war preparations, and has been warned by the Powers that if she persists in her intention of violating the peace she will be left to suffer punishment at the hands of Turkey.

The marriage in Madrid of the Infanta Eulalia, youngest daughter of ex-Queen Isabella, with Prince Antonio, son of the Duc du Montpensier and brother of the Comtesse de Paris, was a brilliant spectacle. Ex-Queen Isabella and Don Francisco gave proof of their reconciliation by jointly giving away their daughter. The dower of the Infanta Eulalia is $700,000, besides $30,000 annually from the civil list. The Duc de Montpensier has settled $12,500 annually on her, and $25,000 on his son. The value of the presents is $200,000.

The Spanish elections have been fixed for April 4.

A town in Burmah garrisoned by 300 British troops is besieged by 9,000 rebels. General Prendergast has started to relieve the place, and a battle is expected.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE GREAT AMERICAN REMEDY.

THE game of "Charles I. and the Long Parliament," with which the Republican Senators apparently propose to amuse themselves during the next few weeks, has really very little interest for the public. The object of it, in so far as it is not intended to while away time which apparently hangs heavily on their hands, is of course to discredit the President and his supporters, so that, in 1888, he may be made to look like a failure, and they like dupes, and the election of some highly objectionable Republican made easier than it was in 1884.

All attempts to make the President produce *all* letters or papers he may receive relating to suspensions or appointments, must, in the nature of things, prove futile. Congress may define as much as it pleases what documents "on file" shall be considered public property, but it cannot prevent the President from deciding what portion of his private correspondence he shall place on file and what not. Whenever, as in the present case, the majority of the Senate belonged to the opposing political party, he would put nothing of the kind on file at all. When, on the other hand, the President and the majority belonged to the same political party, papers relating to removals and appointments, except in rare cases, would not be called for. So that in either case, the public would be left just where it is now—in the dark with regard to the influences and agencies which operate both in the White House and in the Senate, in the filling of vacancies in the Federal service. In other words, in the pending quarrel between the President and Senate, as carried on, the public has really no interest. There is not the smallest reason for believing that, if the Senate won, it would use its victory in any way for the maintenance or promotion of reform. In truth, in the very midst of the controversy, it confirmed the nomination of Freeman Rasin, one of Baltimore's political scamps, the acceptance of whom, at the hands of the Maryland delegation, in so many cases has brought so much discredit on the Administration. No; the Republican Senators do not seek to keep bad men out of office. They have not barred the entrance of a single one under this Administration except Pillsbury and Chase, and they did this for partisan reasons solely, and because Messrs. Hale and Frye made their rejection a personal matter. They make their fight on the suspensions, and not on the nominations, although they have no power to restore a suspended officer to his place, and therefore discussion about suspensions can have no practical result beyond furnishing campaign thunder two years hence.

There is only one way of securing the presentation to the Senate of all the papers and documents which influence the President in making either removals or appointments, and that is a very simple way, and one wholly within the reach of the Senators. They have only to alter their rules, and make executive sessions as public as legislative sessions, in order to drive the President not only into making no nominations for which he cannot give creditable reasons, but into furnishing every creditable reason for the nomination which he may have in his possession. If the discussion of every nomination were public, the Senate would be able to show to the whole country either that no reasons for making it had been furnished, or that the reasons which had been furnished were poor. In either case the President would suffer in the only way, short of impeachment, in which an elected officer can, under our system, be made really to suffer—that is, by popular condemnation. That he suffers with the people by being called "Charles I.," or being assailed with elaborate reports on "precedents," is a Senatorial chimera. The public does not care about precedents in matters of business, and is absolutely indifferent to Senatorial prerogatives. What it wants to know about all this hubbub is whether it is going to improve the administration of the Government. If every nomination were submitted to it through the Senate, the President would be compelled to justify the nomination, because he cannot make bargains with the people, as he can with Senators, so as to dispense with the necessity of explanation. If he refused to offer any explanation of it, he would suffer in just the same way as a plaintiff or defendant suffers in a law-suit or legislative investigation, who refuses to answer questions, or says he does not remember important transactions.

Moreover, unless we are greatly mistaken, the American people have now got so far along the road of administrative reform as to believe that the time has come when no man should apply for any position in their service, important enough to be passed on by the Senate, who shrank from having his fitness discussed before any audience, however large. In truth, the fact that a man does not wish to have his fitness publicly debated, ought now to be considered a primâ-facie disqualification. It is said, in defence of the present secrecy, that innocent men are thus spared the pain of having unfounded charges against them openly examined. But, in the first place, unfounded charges are now frequently made because the privacy of the examination saves those who make them from the shame of exposure when the slander is disproved. In the second place, no man who is so sensitive that he cannot bear to have a false accusation against him publicly refuted by a competent tribunal, ought to seek public office. Private life is the place for him. The Federal service ought to be manned exclusively by persons who are robust enough in their moral fibre to defy informers and calumniators. The truth is, that secrecy is practically intended for the benefit of candidates who are a little scaly, and who have passages in their lives which will not bear examination, or which have interfered with their success in private pursuits, but who are nevertheless successful in getting themselves handsomely endorsed for political services, and have an "influence" among the Senators. The Federal service swarms with such men. They cannot all be got rid of, but we want to keep any more from getting in, and the way to keep them out is to ask them to clear up the cloudy parts of their history before full galleries and an attentive press. We could mention half-a-dozen nominations, made by the present Administration, which never would have been sent in, or, if sent in, never confirmed by an open Senate, after public discussion. Their "papers" would not have borne public examination, and therefore would never have been furnished, either as "private memoranda" or "public records." Consequently we trust that our Senatorial youths will soon get through with their "Charles I. and Long Parliament" play, and settle down to American business.

A STRANGE DOCTRINE INDEED.

THE doctrine which Mr. Evarts appears to have started, and which Mr. Blaine, his successor, adopted, and of which President Cleveland seems to acknowledge the validity, that the United States is under no obligation of international law to protect Chinese residents in this country against outrages committed on them as a class, in default of protection from the State courts or police, might, startling as it is, have passed unnoticed before the war. But if there be any principle which the war established clearly and beyond all peradventure, it was the principle that the United States are to all the rest of the world a nation, and not a confederacy simply. If there be any one result of the war to which more than another the people cling strenuously and fondly, it is this principle. It was for this, more than aught else, that the blood was shed and the money spent. There is nothing on which Americans are to-day more sensitive than any insinuation, or suggestion, or assumption, that our Government speaks to foreigners with less authority and with less command of the resources of the community in men, and money, and devotion, than any other Government in the world. It is only the other day that the Supreme Court decided in the Legal-Tender cases not only that the United States are a "sovereign nation," but that they are so completely a sovereign nation and differ so little from any sovereign nation which has ever existed in Europe, that they are competent, even under our Constitution, to perpetrate that monster abuse of some of the worst of European governments, the making of their own depreciated paper a legal tender in the settlement of private contracts. Now, can it be possible that they are sovereign enough to permit debtors to cheat their creditors, and are not sovereign enough to protect helpless and peaceable foreigners within their borders from murder and pillage?

Here is what President Cleveland in his recent message says has happened to the Chinese in the United States Territories, and things still worse have happened and are happening in some of the States: "The facts show the murder of Chinese subjects, the wounding of others, and the spoliation of the property of all when the unhappy survivors had been driven from their habitations. The law-abiding disposition of these people was the pretext for the attack upon them." He says, also, that "the proceedings taken in the name of justice for the ascertainment of the crime and fixing the responsibility therefor were a ghastly mockery of justice."

Now, is it true, can it be true, will the American people allow it to be true, that a sovereign nation is not responsible to the victims of such outrages? International law

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gives no color of sanction to any such view. Wheaton (Boyd's edition, p. 207) says:

"The American citizen who goes into a foreign country is entitled to the protection of our Government, and if without the violation of any municipal law he should be unjustly oppressed, he would have a right to claim protection of his Government, and the interference of the American Government in his favor would be considered a justifiable interference."

This is from Halleck (p. 276):

"If a state should neglect to enact the requisite laws to restrain its subjects and citizens from systematic and repeated aggressions upon the rights of others, and to enforce such laws when made, it not only exposes itself to the just hostility of the parties aggrieved, but virtually becomes an outlaw from the society of nations, and, by the well-established principles of international jurisprudence, is liable to be attacked and punished by all."

This is from another American authority, Woolsey (p. 62):

"Foreigners admitted into a country are subject to its laws. They are, again, entitled to protection, and failure to secure this or any act of oppression may be a ground of complaint, of retorsion, or even of war, on the part of the native country."

Vattel states the principle thus (Lib. 2, chap 6):

"If a nation should refuse or fail to pass the laws necessary to restrain its citizens from aggression upon other states, or upon their citizens; or if, such laws being enacted, the officers of the state neglect to enforce them, and such aggressions by individuals result therefrom, the state is unquestionably responsible for the injury."

Hall, a recent writer in England, says (p. 178):

"*Prima facie* a state is of course responsible for all acts or omissions taking place within its territory by which another state or the subjects of the latter are injuriously affected. . . . If the acts done are undisguisedly open or of common notoriety, the state is obviously responsible for not using proper means to repress them. As obviously it becomes responsible by way of complicity after the act if it does not inflict punishment to the extent if its legal powers."

Phillimore says: (vol. 2, chap. 2).

"The state to which the foreigner belongs may interfere for his protection when he has received positive maltreatment, or when he has been denied ordinary justice in the foreign country. The state of the foreigner may insist upon reparation immediately in the former case. In the latter the state must be satisfied that its citizen has exhausted the means of legal redress afforded by the tribunals of the country in which he has been injured. If those tribunals are unable or unwilling to entertain and adjudicate upon his grievance, the ground for interference is fairly laid. But it behooves the interfering state to take the utmost care, first, that the commission of the wrong be clearly established; secondly, that the denials of the local tribunals to decide the question at issue be no less clearly established. It is only after these propositions have been irrefragably proved that the state of the foreigner can demand reparation, and it is not until after the executive as well as the judicial authorities have refused redress that recourse can be had to reprisals, much less to war."

As to the defence that our municipal legislation, including the reserved powers of the States in the matter of criminal justice, exempts the National Government from liability to foreigners for the failure of the local authorities to afford protection, we shall make no citations. We take it for granted that it is still fresh in the memory of all our readers over twenty-five years of age, that this defence was set up by England in the *Alabama* case; that it was fiercely and successfully contested by the United States, both in the diplomatic correspondence and before the Geneva Tribunal, and that not a shred of it was left. It was settled then once more, on our demand, both as good law and common sense, that it is the duty of every sovereign state either to provide the necessary legal machinery for the fulfilment of its international obligations, or else to make good the damage which any foreigner may have sustained through its failure to do so. The Chinese, in claiming damages for this great national disgrace, stand as firmly on the law as they stand on abstract justice. We hope they will push their claims with their accustomed tenacity, and we believe they will. It will be the duty of the American people to see that they are not foiled by the quirks and quibbles of ambitious and tricky politicians. The Chinese officials and Government will not lose sight of the claims which are being created on the Pacific side. It is an orderly Government and its officers are trained to their duties. We may not acknowledge our responsibility this year or next, but year after year the claims will be presented patiently but forcibly, until we make up our minds that neither Secretary Evarts, nor Secretary Blaine, nor Secretary Bayard, nor President Cleveland has been right, and we pay the account, as England paid the *Alabama* claims, making merit in our own eyes for the act of justice to which the Orientals have constrained us. Nor is it likely that these claims will be small in amount. A correspondent of *The Evening Post* at San Francisco states that a prominent lawyer had told him that "the suits which will soon be brought will make the taxpayers of the State open their eyes." Among the hundreds of Chinese who have been routed out, or worse, and their property despoiled or destroyed, a large account will be made up.

A VICIOUS WAY OF LEGISLATING.

Two years ago next month, while public attention was concentrated upon the engrossing canvass for the then fast approaching Presidential conventions of the two parties, the Senate passed what came to be known as the Blair bill, appropriating $77,000,000 from the Federal Treasury to be distributed among the States on the basis of illiteracy during a period of eight years. A plausible argument was made for the measure on the ground that the South was too poor, unaided, properly to educate her children, especially the children of the former slaves, and some impressive figures were presented by the Northern philanthropists who advocated the project, which, without being subjected to critical analysis, were generally accepted as sustaining the claim of Southern incapacity. The bill was opposed chiefly by a few Southern Senators on the ground of its unconstitutionality, but this plea made no great impression upon the public mind. Without giving much thought to the matter, people generally concluded that the scheme was a good one. The prevailing feeling was fairly expressed by the New York *Times* when it said, on the morning after the Senate passed the bill, April 9, 1884:

"It is by no means a perfect measure, but it is in the right direction, and if passed it will do good. These are not very strong arguments for the bill in the House, but they are strong with the people, and the House will neglect them at its peril."

The House fortunately did neglect the arguments, and the bill failed to become a law during the Forty-eighth Congress. Promptly upon the opening of the present session Senator Blair reintroduced it, and speedily secured a unanimous report in favor of its passage from the Committee on Education and Labor, supported by the old figures and arguments of the Rev. Mr. Mayo and its other former supporters. Two months ago Mr. Blair confidently counted upon the Senate's soon taking up the bill and passing it again, with the popular endorsement again. It was at this time that, disregarding entirely the question of its constitutionality, we challenged the measure on the ground that the South did not need outside help for her schools, and that educational subsidies would do her more harm than good. This involved a detailed examination of the present condition of the public-school system in the South, and a comparison with the state of things in Northern States no more thickly settled, with a study of the effects of similar bounties upon other States in the past, and an inquiry as to the influence which the prospect of the Blair subsidy had exerted upon the cause of education in the South.

The bill proposed to tax the people of the United States heavily for the purpose of helping to educate colored children in the sixteen old slave States, which were represented as too poor to do the work themselves. The only possible way of giving the bill a thin cloak of constitutionality was to distribute the $77,000,000 among the thirty-eight States and Territories, according to the number of their illiterates respectively, without any regard to whether they needed such a subsidy or not. It was therefore necessary to frame a measure which would give $18,571,468 to States and Territories in which slavery never existed, New York being allotted $2,721,066, or considerably more than the $2,503,170 allotted Arkansas; Pennsylvania, $2,825,324, or almost two-thirds as much as South Carolina's $4,582,792; Ohio, $1,633,718, or not far short of half Louisiana's $3,945,051; and Massachusetts, $1,152,116, or nearly $160,000 more than Florida's $993,548. Missouri, which had so few slaves that there is now only one negro out of every fifteen people in the State, was assigned $2,586,674; and West Virginia, with only one negro out of every twenty-five people, $1,057,895. A more circuitous way of reaching the ostensible end, of educating colored children where the States could not do it, it is impossible to imagine.

It was easy to show that the claim of Southern incapacity to maintain a decent school system was untenable, being based upon exaggerated representations of that section's poverty and backwardness in a period from which she has now emerged. Missouri, for instance, which was to receive over $2,500,000 on the ground of her poverty, already keeps her schools open, on the average, 113 days in the year, against 114 days in Maine, and only 99½ in New Hampshire, and expends $8 13 upon each pupil enrolled, against only $9 65 in New Hampshire, and but $7 95 in Maine, while the proportion of all children of the school age enrolled in school (527,452 out of 778,578) is 67.7 against 68.5 in Maine (145,438 out of 212,390). Florida, a State with a large negro element (47 out of every 100 souls), which was to get nearly a million dollars, is a State whose school superintendent was able to say in his last report that the number of children of the school age was 66,798, of whom there were

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enrolled in school 62,327, whose daily average attendance was 45,850—"a percentage of enrolment and daily attendance equal to any State in the Union as reported from the educational departments," and far superior to the record of Maine, New Hampshire, or Vermont. Georgia, which was to receive the largest slice of all—$6,448,442—is the richest State in the South, and her Legislature was plainly told by the Commissioner of Schools three years ago that the moderate tax of only one-fifth of one per cent., which could be imposed "without unduly burdening the people," would keep the schools in operation for six months, against only about four and a-half months in Maine and four in New Hampshire. Even South Carolina, whose case is most desperate by reason of her great negro population, already has more than 63 per cent. of her children of school age (178,023 out of 281,664) enrolled in school, while in Vermont between 1860 and 1865 the corresponding proportion (68,525 out of 87,836) was only about 78 per cent., and the average length of the school year (75 days) is about two-thirds the average of 119 days in Vermont a quarter of a century ago.

The bad effect of school subsidies in the past was shown by the experience of Connecticut with her Western Reserve Fund, which Mr. C. D. Hine, Secretary of the State Board of Education, informed us had caused "a very striking deterioration" in the character of the schools by dwarfing local effort, so that the length of schools in many places was actually reduced to the short time which the fund would pay for, and he rejoiced to say that, by reason of the growth of population and the consequent diminution of the income for each child, "the danger from this direction is passed and cannot return." The disastrous consequences which the mere agitation of the Blair bill has produced in the South were shown by the official testimony of Superintendent Coward, of South Carolina, in his annual report for 1884, where he testifies that, in addition to other drawbacks to public education during the year, "the discussion of the policy of Federal aid for the suppression of illiteracy revived into active expression all the latent or hitherto silent opposition to the common-school system of the State"; and still more impressively by the experience of Georgia, where Mr. Woodrow Wilson has described his hearing a discussion in which the Legislature was asked to pass a law imposing the tax recommended by the School Commissioner, and instead adopted a resolution urging the State's Congressmen to support the Blair bill, under which Georgia would receive the first year from the nation $586,225, or almost exactly the sum which the tax that could have been imposed "without unduly burdening the people" would have added to the present school fund.

The presentation of these facts and figures has produced a complete change in the attitude of the country toward this measure, which ex-Governor Chamberlain, of South Carolina, the other day pronounced now "fatally discredited in the public mind." Instead of the general endorsement which the bill received from the press two years ago, there are now barely half-a-dozen journals of standing which longer support it. The revolution of sentiment is well illustrated in the attitude of the New York *Times*, which said on Saturday:

> "In the debate which had been going on for some days the opponents of the bill had decidedly the best of the argument, but many Senators were committed upon it by their votes in a former Congress, when it was not so fully considered. There will be no such obstacle to independent judgment in the House. . . . There has been a great change of sentiment on the subject since it was first broached, and the feeling seems to be spreading that the Southern States, where illiteracy is most prevalent, will be able to provide for the education of their own people, and will be more likely to do so if left to themselves."

There has been an equal change in the honest sentiment of Senators regarding the measure. Mr. Plumb, of Kansas, declared last week—and nobody dared to question the truth of his statement—that he could count on the fingers of his two hands the Senators who were actually in favor of the measure, who would "dare avow that they are for it as an original proposition, or as one that commends itself to their judgment." But the great majority had committed themselves to its support in the past, and though they would privately admit that it was a bad bill, which ought to be defeated, they insisted upon keeping a record for consistency in publicly voting for it, and passed it on Friday, 36 to 11, being substantially the same as the vote in 1884. The majority of the Republicans recorded themselves thus because they had become satisfied that the measure would be defeated in the House, and thought it would look better for them to vote the same way as they had done before and leave the Representatives to defeat the bill, than to be honest and confess that they made a mistake in supporting it two years ago. As the Washington correspondent of the Springfield *Republican* put it a few days ago: "The bill will pass because the Republican Senators believe it will fail in the House, and they prefer to have that body take the responsibility of it to doing it themselves."

This is a peculiarly striking case of a vicious way of legislating, which too often disgraces our law-making bodies. New York may well be ashamed of her representation, Mr. Miller voting for the bill to "save his record," and Mr. Evarts because Republicans generally were on that side. It is a relief to turn from such a showing to the manly course adopted by Mr. Frye of Maine, who voted for the bill hastily two years ago, and, upon sober second thought, against it on Friday, being joined in his opposition by his brother Senator from Maine, Ingalls and Plumb from Kansas, and Jones from Nevada, while Hawley and Platt of Connecticut, and several other Republican Senators, would have voted the same way if they had not been absent or paired.

THE CONDITION OF THE COAST SURVEY.

RECENT despatches to the daily press remind us that the management of the Coast Survey is among the unsettled questions with which the Administration is confronted, and show that the present state of that bureau calls loudly for action. The events of last summer are so well known to our readers that only a brief outline of their course is necessary. For several years it was painfully evident to all intimately acquainted with the circumstances that the physical and mental conditions of the responsible head of the bureau were such as to unfit him for his important trust. When an investigation was at last ordered, the only wonder to well-informed persons was that it had not been undertaken a year earlier. The speedy suspension and resignation or dismissal of the Superintendent were among its natural and inevitable results, and, in the regular course of things, the vacancy would have been soon filled by appointing a Superintendent in whose ability and integrity the appointing power had entire confidence.

But things did not go on in their regular course. A general impression seems to have pervaded Administration circles that faults so serious as those of the late Superintendent indicated widespread corruption in the service which he conducted; and it was suspected that this same corruption extended to other bureaus, notably to the Geological Survey. To ferret out such evil, if it existed, was an obvious public duty, to the performance of which the efforts of the Treasury Department were directed. The complete vindication of Major Powell's management of the Geological Survey is a matter of history which we mention in passing, because the two surveys were associated in both the official and the public mind. To facilitate the investigation of the Coast Survey the Chairman of the Investigating Committee was appointed Superintendent in place of the man removed on his report, not, it would seem, on account of his qualifications for the place, but to tide over the emergency and to enable him to continue his investigations.

It is an open secret that Mr. Thorne's searching inquiries have failed to justify the charge of general or widespread corruption in the Coast Survey. The numerous stories of fraud and mismanagement which were so widely circulated in the newspapers all resolved themselves into misstatements or fabrications when searched into. Some acts of doubtful legality had been performed by order of the Superintendent, but none were of so flagrant a nature that the assistants who obeyed the orders of their superior could be condemned for so doing. The few cases of inefficiency in the performance of duty were of the kind that are always found in a Government office with a long list of employees. It is now reported that even in these few cases the report of the Committee has been found to be severe rather than just, so far, at least, as the clerical and scientific force are concerned.

The most serious financial question which has been encountered concerns the pay and allowances of assistants. Until 1883 the salaries of assistants, instead of being fixed by law, were left to the discretion of the Superintendent. The regulations of the office provided that the assistants should have one salary when on duty and a diminished one when waiting orders, thus modelling the service after that of the navy. The law of 1883 provided only one salary for each assistant, and this was made to conform as closely as practicable to the salary prescribed for duty by the old regulations. The Superintendent held that this law did away with the regulations, and entitled each assistant to his full salary even when waiting orders. This view has been contested by the accounting officers of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Treasury, but we are not aware that a final decision has been reached. However the question may be decided, there is no ground for impugning the integrity of the men who drew their salaries. The question is one on which opinions might well differ, and there can be no ground for claiming that the assistants should have gone behind the decision of the authorities for the time being by refusing to accept the proffered salaries.

The Washington despatches to which we have alluded, partake so largely of the character of personal complaints that we should have passed them without notice but for the demoralized condition which they indicate. The circumstances under which Mr. Thorne has been holding the position of Superintendent are such as could hardly lead to any other result. Appointed to discover weak points of the Survey, he is in no way identified either with its work or its interests. His position and authority are not respected either by his subordinates or by the Treasury officials. He assumed the position of chief investigator under the direction of the First Auditor of the Treasury, and it would seem from all accounts that Mr. Chenowith has never ceased to look upon him as one of his lieutenants. Gossip has it that the Second Comptroller, who has officially nothing to do with the matter, is really as powerful as Mr. Thorne in deciding the policy of the survey, and, like Mr. Chenowith, occupies himself in listening to the stories of its dissatisfied employees. The result is that the institution, instead of being guided, is drifting along without reference to the rocks and shoals which surround it.

It is quite certain that no bureau can go on in this way with three or four heads trying to run it, not one of whom is held responsible for it, without a speedy loss of its *esprit de corps* and a complete subversion of all discipline. The only reason yet assigned for allowing such a state of affairs to continue more than six months is, that no man really fit for the office of Superintendent would be willing to accept it under such conditions. Very likely this is true, but, if so, it only emphasizes the necessity of changing the conditions as speedily as possible.

GERMAN OPERA.

LAST week the musical season reached the highest tide ever known. The first performance in America of Wagner's "Parsifal" and Delibes's "Lakmé," besides "Rienzi," "Tannhäuser," "Walküre," "Queen of Sheba," "Orpheus and Eurydice," two Thomas concerts, the public rehearsal and concert of the Symphony Society, not to mention a number of miscellaneous concerts, operettas, etc., all in one week—surely neither New York nor any other city has ever been visited by such a flood of musical entertainments. And inasmuch as most of them are well attended, it would seem as if New York were ambitious to become the world's musical metropolis, as Paris was formerly, and Vienna now is. The foreign artists who are with us at present are amazed at the prolificness and prosperity of our musical season, which, they declare, is without a parallel abroad.

This week, however, ebb-tide has set in. The German Opera Company at the Metropolitan is the first to retire from the field—not, indeed, for the reason that caused Mr. Mapleson to retire from the contest with his Italian Opera Company, but because the regular season of thirteen weeks has come to an end. From the combined artistic and financial points of view it has been beyond comparison the most successful opera season ever given in New York. In the days of exaggerated prima-donna worship there may have been managers whose receipts were as large as Mr. Stanton's this year; and not a few operas have been produced heretofore in an excellent manner. But never before have works of the highest musical merit been received with so much favor or so well interpreted; and this is what Mr. Stanton may place to his credit, besides the remarkable fact that not a single substitution has been made, during the whole season, for the operas advertised. Great as was the success of last year's German opera season, the results are much more favorable this year, and would have been still more so had it not been for an untimely visit to Philadelphia.

The Metropolitan opera, fortunately, is not intended to be a money-making institution. The stockholders are satisfied if they clear expenses; and should there be a deficit they are willing to pay it, as long as they have their amusement. This happy arrangement is a great advantage to the manager, who, like the managers of foreign state-supported opera-houses, is thereby enabled to spend a sum of money on a single opera which a manager who stands on his own feet would never dare to risk. At the same time the stockholders are obliged to pay some deference to the public's tastes and desires, if they do not wish to make too great inroads on their own purses. Not a few of them, it is well known, go to the opera to be seen and heard rather than to hear; and this contingent probably did not think favorably of several of the operas given this year, notably the "Meistersinger." But as the public came to these performances in great and increasing crowds, they felt bound to let it have its way and to submit patiently to no fewer than eight performances of this masterwork.

The company which Mr. Stanton and Mr. Damrosch brought over from Europe this winter has proved itself in most respects superior to last year's, except that the superb dramatic art of Frau Materna and Herr Scl.ott has been frequently missed. With the exception of these two vocalists and Frau Schroeder-Hanfstängl, the best artists of last year have been retained. Among the new-comers Frl. Lehmann and Herr Fischer have won special favor, and will return next year. In their sphere they are almost as perfect as Patti is in hers. But their sphere is a much higher one than Patti's. They have done a great deal towards dispelling the superstition that Wagner's vocal method sacrifices beauty of tone and smoothness of execution to distinct enunciation. Herr Fischer's *Hans Sachs* and Frl. Lehmann's *Venus*, for instance, will long be remembered as impersonations in which a great histrionic talent is combined with a rich resonant voice, elegant vocal method, distinct pronunciation of the words, and an appreciation of their meaning and emotional import rarely shown on the operatic stage. The acquisition of Herr Seidl as conductor, and his reëngagement for at least three years more, was another clever stroke of Mr. Stanton's managerial policy. No better man for the place could possibly have been secured—not even Hans Richter, who, being older, would not perhaps have worked for the good of the cause with all the zeal that Herr Seidl has displayed. Herr Seidl resembles Hans Richter not only in being a Wagnerian specialist, but in being, besides, thoroughly at home in classical and non-German music, as he showed in his Bayreuth concert, and by his magnificent and absolutely flawless conducting of "Carmen" and "Faust" in strictest accordance with the best Parisian traditions, as we know from personal experience. In "Carmen" Herr Seidl showed to especial advantage, for he is a Hungarian, and therefore familiar from his infancy with the exotic gypsy rhythms similar to those that give "Carmen" its special flavor. The concert which Herr Seidl gave in behalf of the Bayreuth funds showed him to possess such a deep insight into the poetic qualities of the great symphonist, that the announcement will be hailed with pleasure that next year he will give a series of symphony concerts.

To Herr Seidl's special ability, perhaps more even than to the able work of the soloists at the Metropolitan, is due the fact that the repertory has become more Wagnerian even than it was last year, when 28 out of 58 performances were devoted to his works. This year Wagner got 28 out of 52 performances—"Die Meistersinger" having been given 8 times, "Rienzi" 7, "Lohengrin" 5, "Tannhäuser" 4, "Walküre" 4. Of course it was impossible to give the latter three operas as often as last year, for in that case only twelve performances would have remained for all other composers, which would have been a very one-sided and unsatisfactory arrangement. The greatest financial success of the year has been Goldmark's "Queen of Sheba," which has had fifteen representations, a success quite out of proportion to its intrinsic musical merits, and due to a very large extent to the unprecedented splendor of its scenic outfit. "Rienzi" also owed much of its popularity to its scenic effects. It would be unwise, however, to attach too much importance to these considerations, for experience proves that works which chiefly owe their popularity to the *mise-en-scène* the first season, generally fall flat the next season. The "Prophète," for example, which was so highly commended for its scenic attire, had nine performances last year and only three this year. In the long run those works will be found to pay best which have the most dramatic music and plots, and for this reason the success of the "Meistersinger" is much more significant than the success of "Rienzi" or the "Queen of Sheba," for it will be more lasting. Nevertheless, scenic splendor is of great importance in the modern opera, and it is well worth noting that the predominance of Wagner at the Metropolitan is the more remarkable inasmuch as none of his operas has been placed on the stage with anything like the scenic splendor that has been lavished on the "Queen of Sheba" and on "Faust," though no operas are so available for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the scene-painter as Wagner's. The comparatively shabby *mise-en-scène* of "Tannhäuser" and "Lohengrin" may be pardoned in view of the fact that they were prepared last year, before the success of German opera was assured; but the cramped and crowded scene in the last act of the "Meistersinger" could and should have been immensely improved upon. If there is one thing certain in operatic matters, it is that every dollar spent in realizing Wagner's exact scenic as well as poetic and musical intentions will bear a hundred-fold interest.

In behalf of the chorus and orchestra it must be said that they were an improvement on last year's. Though generally satisfactory and often excellent, there is room for further improvement; and Herr Seidl, who goes abroad in May to assist at the Bayreuth festival, and who is thoroughly at home at all the German opera-houses, will no doubt see that such shortcomings as were perceptible this year will not recur. The greatest task before Herr Seidl and Mr. Stanton is the engagement of suitable dramatic and lyric tenors. It is one of the most curious of physiological problems why in these days, when hundreds of thousands of men are at their wit's end what to do for a living, there should be only five or six available tenors on the operatic stage, well paid as they are. Of the two tenors heard this year at the Metropolitan both had their merits, but neither is a great enough artist for the place. Of the German tenors that have been mentioned as likely to visit us, Winkelmann, Goetz, Vogl, and Niemann have been named, but nothing is certain as yet. It is understood that they all are willing to come, for America still remains the Eldorado for singers. As regards German singers in general, it is worth noting that they are finding favor at present not only in this country, but in southern Europe. Frau Kupfer, of Vienna, has made such a success in Spain that the managers of the Grand Opéra in Paris are endeavoring to secure her services. Spain, in fact, is becoming quite German in its musical tastes, notwithstanding recent political difficulties, the Spanish being apparently more sensible than the French in this matter. Wagner's operas have been sung in all Spanish cities this winter. At Madrid "Lohengrin" has been given twenty times, and arrangements are in progress for a complete Wagner cyclus next year.

On the other hand, Patti's recent fiasco in Paris shows that the lyric "star" business is in its last stages of decadence. And this is, after all, the most important consideration regarding our present opera season, including the performances of the American Opera Company. Opera is no longer art for the artist's sake, but art for art's sake. A few years ago people said: "Patti is going to sing to-night" — no matter what; now they say, "The opera to-night is 'Tannhäuser,' or 'Lakmé.'" And experience in European cities proves that when once this stage is reached, when once grand opera has been given with a grand ensemble, there is no danger of a relapse into the Italian star system. The announcement that German opera is to be continued for three years longer at the Metropolitan, therefore, very probably means a great many more than three years.

PARLIAMENT AND CONVOCATION.

LONDON, February 23, 1886.

PARLIAMENT met again on Thursday last, and settled down to the routine of a working session more steadily than might have been expected in the present condition of parties. The House of Commons is still hampered in its movements by the new members, who crowd into the galleries and the space behind the bar, and swell the cry for a more commodious chamber, in which they might all find seats on the floor. Committee of Supply has a marked effect in moderating the enthusiasm of inexperienced legislators, and before the estimates are out of hand the House may turn out to be large enough. For the present, the Government is getting its money easily; the masters of obstruction hold their hands till they see what is to befall them. There are some possibilities of delay in this evening's debate, which turns on the rights and wrongs of Ireland in the matter of imperial taxation. The Government will no doubt endeavor to treat the question as a part of the general problem of home rule, to promise inquiry and examination, and to postpone definite action till after the statement which the Prime Minister has undertaken to lay before Parliament about the beginning of April. In the meantime, some measures of secondary political importance will have some chance of making progress. Mr. Trevelyan comes first with his Crofters' Bill—a more radical bill than the one introduced in the last session of the late Parliament, and dropped on Lord Salisbury's accession to office. The present bill will encounter little opposition in the House of Commons, unless, it may be, from the Crofters' friends, who think that it does not go far enough. As for the Lords, they will think twice before they reject or seriously modify the provisions of a Crofters' Bill at the present moment. Affairs look serious in the Highlands; and the landlords have virtually admitted their inability to resist the demands of the peasantry, enforced by the new power of the franchise. The Marquis of Stafford is heir to the vast estates of the Duke of Sutherland, but he could not secure his election as member of his own county without adopting the entire Crofter programme. Now, in the character of Crofters' friend, he runs a neck-and-neck race with Dr. Clark, M. P.—"lord of his learning and no land beside"—a gentleman whom some tolerably advanced Scotch Liberals used to regard as a revolutionary of the school of Henry George.

When the immediate claims of the Crofters are satisfied, we shall have Mr. Chamberlain's measure for the reform of social government. It must not be supposed that the energies of Mr. Chamberlain are entirely absorbed in the rearrangement of areas and rates. He is frequently absent from the Treasury bench; but he never was more active in making his personal influence felt among all the sections of his own party. He takes no pains to conceal his opinion that Mr. Gladstone's third administration will be a short one; he anticipates the possible reconstruction of the party at no distant date. As yet, Mr. Chamberlain is by no means strong enough to pose as the inevitable successor of Mr. Gladstone. His practical ability and debating powers are unquestionably first-rate; and those who know him best have perfect confidence in the rectitude of his intentions. But he has frightened many sober people by the headstrong levity of his judgment, and the eagerness which he displays to act as a judge and a divider between property and poverty. Perhaps Mr. Chamberlain's best chance lies in the absence of any conspicuously better man. Lord Hartington inspires confidence among all kinds of Liberals; but if he finds his back seat comfortable, he may refuse to descend again into the arena. Among the rest of Mr. Gladstone's colleagues and ex-colleagues, it may be doubted whether there is one who would really like to lead the House of Commons with Mr. Chamberlain sitting beside him.

A year ago almost any Radical would tell you that the future leadership lay between Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Dilke, and many were inclined to put their faith in Sir Charles as the safer, though perhaps the less brilliant, of the two. Sir Charles is exiled from public life for the time being, by the deplorable scandal which led to the proceedings in Crawford vs. Crawford and Dilke. The judgment in the case was no doubt perfectly good in point of law; but the public cannot very well understand it. A lady is divorced from her husband on the ground of misconduct with a certain person; at the same time it is held that there is so little evidence against that person that he is not even called upon to deny the charge made against him. So long as the matter remains where it is, the moral judgment of society remains suspended. If it be asked whether Sir Charles Dilke will return to public life, the answer is that he may do so if he can give good evidence to show that Mrs. Crawford's story is untrue. This he may perhaps manage by inducing the Queen's Proctor to intervene, in order to prevent Mr. Justice Butt's decree from being made absolute. I do not believe that anything short of a legal inquiry, resulting in his exculpation, would enable Sir Charles to resume his old position in the Liberal party. Even in the time of Lord Melbourne it was thought that a scandal of this kind ought to damage the reputation of a statesman. English society has become more moral in some respects since then, and Mrs. Crawford's story is ten times worse than anything that was ever alleged against Lord Melbourne.

When the Conservatives are in opposition they allow the bonds of party discipline to be indefinitely relaxed. The benches assigned to them are apt to exhibit empty spaces, which afford room for an overflow from the Liberal side; and their leaders wearily refrain from leading, with the exception of Lord Randolph Churchill, who is, like the British army, always ready to "go anywhere and do anything." Sir Michael Hicks-Beach is more and more effaced, and would probably not be prepared to give any very large sum for his chance of leading the Commons once more. At the present moment Lord Randolph is in Ulster, stirring up the Orangemen to resist Mr. Gladstone's supposed design to destroy the legislative union between Great Britain and Ireland. One quality required by the "coming leader" of a large party is audacious inconsistency; and this Lord Randolph possesses in perfection. A few months ago, when he was a candidate for Birmingham and wanted the Irish vote, he leaned toward home rule, decried coercion, and exchanged compliments with Mr. Parnell. When he came into office, he threw in his lot with those members of Lord Salisbury's Cabinet who wanted to "dish the Whigs" by offering large concessions to Irish opinion. At the present moment the Conservatives have nothing to expect from the Parnellites; but they do expect to upset Mr. Gladstone by exciting English opinion against him if he tampers, or seems to tamper, with the Union. Therefore Lord Randolph has taken the shamrock out of his cap, gone to Belfast, and invited Ulster to charge with all her chivalry in defence of the Constitution. What will the Parnellites say to this? Less, perhaps, than some may suppose. Lord Randolph is so perfectly frank, he "turns his back on himself" so promptly and openly, that nobody has the heart to be severe with him. At the same time it is matter for deep regret that Ireland at this moment should be the cockpit for English parties to fight in. The state of the country is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most deplorable; the sense of insecurity pervades every department of commercial and social life, and one knows not what can be done by merely political means to put an end to anarchy and ill-feeling. Irish politicians seem to have no suggestion to offer; Mr. Parnell does not think it necessary to appear in the House of Commons; his followers sit there in rows, looking as dull as so many Liverpool cotton brokers suffering from the depression of trade. Even Captain O'Shea's spirits must have sunk a little when he was introduced last night. His countrymen observed a stony silence, and the two gentlemen who introduced him left a space on each side of him as they marched up to the table, indicating thereby that they were not to be held personally responsible for the "Whig" protégés of the Nationalist leader.

Students of our Constitution are aware that England is happy enough to possess two sets of representative institutions. While Parliament is sitting in Westminster Palace, the clergy, who still form a separate estate of the realm, are represented in the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, now sitting in the precincts of Westminster Abbey. This ancient body has, indeed, lost much of its former importance. It can do nothing without license from the Crown; and the advisers of the Crown are accustomed, as Lord Westbury said, "when Convocation is harmlessly employed, to let it alone; when it proceeds to actual business, to dissolve it without delay." The powers of Convocation have not been extended, but it has succeeded in adding to itself a new House of Laymen, which may advise the bishops and clergy how most effectively to promote the work of church reform. The points now under discussion are the abuses of ecclesiastical patronage, the necessity for taking some steps to remove incompetent and superannuated clergymen, and the possibility of forming lay parochial boards to assist in the government of the Church. Bills dealing with these points will be presented to Parliament before long.

This movement for the reform of the Episcopalian Church of England runs parallel with the movement for the "reconstruction" of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland. In both countries the adherents of the established churches found themselves stronger in voting power than they expected to be in the last general election. They hope, by timely concessions and reforms, to popularize the national establishments, and so to render them safe against the attacks of the Liberation Society. The Liberationists, on their side, are watching these new movements with the keenest vigilance. They think, not without reason, that they are themselves the original cause of this new-born zeal for reform; and when the "reconstruction" policy comes before Parliament, they will have an opportunity of criticising it from their own political point of view. Looking at it merely as a party question, it will be interesting to note the course of Liberal statesmanship in relation to this subject. The Church Reformer, on the one side, says: "We mean to make disestablishment too hot for any Liberal statesman to take it up." The Liberationist, on the other hand, says: "We mean to show the Liberal leaders that our support is not to be had for nothing. Mr. Gladstone has told us that the Dissenters are the backbone of his party; some day soon we shall ask him to choose between taking up our policy and dispensing with his backbone." Hitherto the weakness of the Liberationist party has been this—that the political Dissenters are, as a rule, advanced Liberals, who would never dream of voting for a Conservative: The political Churchmen are, as a rule, moderate Liberals, who will vote Conservative if they are alarmed about the Church. It remains to be seen whether the defenders of the Church have done wisely to put their schemes of reform into such a shape that they must come up for Parliamentary discussion. There are always incidents in the ecclesiastical debates of the House of Commons which cause even moderate men to doubt the wisdom of preserving a system that makes Parliament responsible for the doctrine and worship of the Church. R.

THE CONQUEST OF UPPER BURMAH.

LONDON, February 18, 1886.

INCLUDING this last expedition, it has needed three wars to effect the incorporation of all Burmah with the British dominions in India. The first Burmese war occurred so far back as 1824-26, when Lord Amherst was Governor-General of India. This was one of the costliest wars ever waged in India. More than twenty thousand of our soldiers—the majority being English—perished, mainly from fever contracted in the malarious forests upon either bank of the Irrawaddy, and the expenditure, as acknowledged by the Indian Government, amounted to fifteen millions, the real cost being, in all probability, much greater. The war, however, was ultimately successful. Amarapura, the Burmese capital, lay at our mercy when the Burmese monarch consented to obtain peace by the sacrifice of the provinces of Arakan and Tenasserim.

The second Burmese war occurred in 1853, when Lord Dalhousie was Governor-General. This, though not marked by the blunders, delays, and disasters of the first war, was by no means an easy or an expeditious affair. The Burmese opposed a stout resistance to the advance of the English army, and our losses were considerable. Our success was at the same time decisive, and had Lord Dalhousie desired to do so, he might have deposed without difficulty the native dynasty and annexed the whole of Burmah. But he shrank from a step which, for a distance of four hundred miles, would have aligned the frontier of our Indian Empire with that of China. This was in itself a wise scruple, but unluckily, as I believe, for both India and England, it only prevailed so far upon the mind of Lord Dalhousie as to cause him to adopt a policy which postponed but did not avert the result which he feared. He did not dethrone the King of Burmah; he merely cut his dominions in two, by an arbitrary line, incorporating one half with India and leaving the poorer half in his possession. It was impossible for such an artificial arrangement to endure, and that it has lasted so long has been due solely to the accident of the great Indian insurrection of 1857 following so closely upon the heels of the last Burmese war. That great convulsion, caused as it so largely was by the annexations of Lord Dalhousie, gave a check to all schemes of territorial expansion, from which they are only now beginning to recover.

Lord Lawrence was the last of our great Indian Governors whose dealings with independent native states bore the impress of that equity and moderation which the ordeal of 1857 had burned, so, to speak, into the minds of those who had passed through it. The revival of a policy of aggression was simultaneous with his withdrawal from public life. Lord Lytton's invasion of Afghanistan was the first tentative experiment in the new direction. The annexation of Burmah marks the formal return to a policy expressly repudiated in the Royal Proclamation addressed to the people of India after the suppression of the mutiny. This fact it is which gives to the conquest of Burmah a special significance which has not been missed by the native princes of India, who have been taught to regard the National Proclamation of 1858, with its emphatic renunciation of all lust for territory, as the Magna Charta of their rights and liberties.

Various pretexts have been assigned in justification of our invasion of Upper Burmah, but none of them will bear a moment's examination. It has been alleged, for example, that the French were intriguing to establish themselves in virtual possession of the country, and were at the very point of success. There is not a shadow of truth in this, and those who circulated the report were well aware that it could not be true. No Power could exist in Burmah without our permission. Not only are the mouths of the Irrawaddy in our possession, precluding, alike, both egress and ingress from Upper Burmah, but the population are dependent for two essential articles of their diet upon the salt and rice imported from British Burmah. Again, it has been alleged that King Theebaw was a drunken savage, who spent his time in massacring his subjects, and that humanity called upon us to extend the blessings of British rule to his subjects. In reply to this, it may be stated that King Theebaw is not a *drunken* savage; he is, on the contrary, a total abstainer; and though he cannot be acquitted of cruelty, he is not, even in this respect, to be compared to the Amir of Afghanistan, to whom we pay a quarter of a million a year and whom we have pledged ourselves to protect against all his enemies. Then it has been pretended that, owing to the misrule of King Theebaw, British trade with Upper Burmah has well-nigh suffered eclipse. This is altogether false. Trade with Upper Burmah has been steadily on the increase since Theebaw ascended the throne, and never at any previous time was it so large as immediately before the declaration of war. No; the true efficient cause of the deposition of Theebaw and the destruction of Burmese independence is the commercial depression in Great Britain. In India itself, among the English community, war and conquest constitute a policy which is always and invariably popular. It is a break in the profound monotony of Indian life. It means to the official classes honor, distinctions, pecuniary gains, new offices. In the case of Upper Burmah, these inducements were recruited by the presence in Rangoon of a mercantile community who had long fretted against the impediments to commerce imposed by a semi-barbarous Government such as existed at Mandalay. But so long as there was no pressure from home, the Government of India had resisted the pressure brought to bear upon it both by its own officials and the Rangoon merchants. It succumbed instantly when the mercantile community at home joined hands with the mercantile community of Rangoon. The long-continued commercial depression has caused the manufacturers and traders of Lancashire to hunger for a "new market," like as the hart desireth the water-brooks; and the conquest of Upper Burmah promised the opening up of a "new market" which would be none the less acceptable because the entire cost of its acquisition would be defrayed by the opulent Indian peasantry.

To prepare the way for conquest the usual fables were diligently spread abroad in the press. Our "prestige" among our Indian subjects was declared to be wounded almost past recovery in consequence of the unpunished insolence of King Theebaw. The people of Upper Burmah were depicted as coming down to the frontier in large crowds, entreating the English officials to come over and help them. The Chinese, it was boldly asserted, were only awaiting our arrival upon their frontier in order to abandon their traditional exclusiveness, and enter into commercial relations in the free and equitable spirit of Richard Cobden. Under the influence of these pleasant hallucinations we entered into the war with a light heart. We experienced no difficulty in deposing King Theebaw, in occupying his capital, and in issuing a proclamation declaring

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Upper Burmah to be from henceforth a province of British India. And now, as is our wont in these little wars, we find ourselves compelled to take account of the disagreeable realities of the situation. The war is profoundly distasteful to the people of India. It is so for a double reason. In the independent States, both among the princes and peoples, it has kindled the alarm and distrust which the Royal Proclamation of 1858 was intended to set at rest forever. They cannot but see that the reasons assigned in justification of the conquest of Upper Burmah are identical with those which formed the stock arguments of Lord Dalhousie whenever he desired to extinguish an independent native principality, and may at any moment be directed with equal effect against their own existence. But what alarms them most is the fear that the National Proclamation has lost its virtue—that it can no longer be appealed to as a true expression of the policy of England as distinct from that of the Indian Bureaucracy. Those who remember how largely similar feelings were at work in 1857 will not undervalue the significance of this revival. But it is among the people of British India properly so called that the war has evoked the loudest expressions of resentment, and not without cause. Burmah, it must be remembered, is no part of India. Its people differ from the people of India in language, in appearance, in manners, in religion. Whatever advantages may accrue to British traders from the new conquest, none whatever can accrue to the people of India. They neither trade with Burmah nor do they ever go to the country; yet upon their shoulders has been laid the entire cost of the acquisition of this new province. The two wars of 1826 and 1853 added about seventeen millions to the Indian debt, and this last expedition, before it is completed, will, in all probability, swell the amount to twenty millions. Nor is this all. Before the commencement of the war all the "experts" were confident, as they always are, that the new territory would not only pay the costs of its administration, but render a handsome surplus for the benefit of India generally. There is, of course, not a possibility of any such thing. Upper Burmah, for many a long year, will not be self-supporting—or nearly so. The Indian army will have to be increased in order to provide troops for the defence of the new frontier, and it is difficult to see how the money is to be obtained without the imposition of additional taxation—this, moreover, at a time when terror at the approach of Russia to Herat has just raised the military budget from seventeen to nineteen millions annually, and compelled the Indian Government to have recourse to that most oppressive of imposts in India—an income tax—in order to meet this heavy charge.

The element, however, in the new situation which excites the greatest misgiving is unquestionably the attitude taken up by China. The bait which allured the commercial classes in Great Britain to give their approval to the invasion of Upper Burmah was the prospect of a large and lucrative trade to be opened up with the Chinese province of Yunnan. It is now admitted that, even if all else went well, there is no chance of this prospect being realized. Yunnan was the theatre of the great Panthay insurrection, which for many years defeated every effort of the Chinese Government for its suppression. When at last it yielded to the persistency of the Pekin authorities, the latter inflicted a frightful retaliation upon the rebellious province. The populations of city after city were massacred wholesale. The province may be said to have been left desolate and without inhabitants, and a century at least of peace and quiet will be needed to restore its former prosperity. But in addition to this, between Yunnan and Upper Burmah rise range upon range of lofty, inaccessible hills, sparsely peopled by mountain tribes, and possessing neither the roads nor the food needed for the passage of an extensive commerce. Even if there existed on the part of the Chinese authorities a genuine desire to establish free commercial relations with the "foreign devils" in Upper Burmah, it would not be practicable until the hill country had been pacified and trade routes constructed. But there exists no such desire. Twice within the last fifteen years has the Indian Government sent missions up the Irrawaddy to establish a trade between Upper Burmah and China, and on both occasions were the missions forced to turn and seek safety in flight from the hostility of the Chinese officials. The last attempt brought about the murder of young Margary, which very nearly involved England in a war with China.

At present, however, the Chinese are not content with passive obstruction. They have set up a claim for substantial "compensation." The Pekin Government pretends to have had rights of suzerainty over Upper Burmah, and demands, as compensation for the injury done to these rights by the deposition of King Theebaw, the cession of the upper reaches of the Irrawaddy, including the town of Bhamo, which, in the event of a trade being developed, would constitute the chief commercial centre. China, in a word, is playing with the English in Upper Burmah precisely the same game which she played with such harassing consequences with the French in Tonquin. It is impossible for the Indian Government, by yielding to the Chinese demands, to make practical acknowledgment of a weakness which China could never extort from the weakest of the Burmese monarchs; and this it is which makes the situation so serious. Upper Burmah, although occupied by our troops, is far from being pacified. The introduction of British rule into a native state, whatever may be its advantages to the great body of the population, means utter ruin and dishonor to the powerful, the ambitious, and the able. It means the forfeiture, not merely of their political and social influence, but the deprivation of their means of livelihood. They are literally reduced to beggary. This is the meaning of "the Dacoity" which is at present troubling the military authorities at Mandalay. These outlaws, or rather their chiefs, are men whom the cast-iron system of British administration has driven into outlawry; and the character of the country in Upper Burmah furnishes extraordinary facilities for this species of bush fighting. Roads there are none in the country. The population is almost wholly settled upon the banks of the Irrawaddy, and the rest of the country consists either of high mountains or is covered with primeval forest and impenetrable undergrowth. Troops can only move in small columns, and must carry all their provisions with them. The circumstances are such that the Chinese authorities, by secretly assisting those who are in arms against the British, might, without compromising themselves, render our situation an intolerable one. Great Britain, it must be remembered, is no longer politically an island severed by its streak of silver sea from the other nations of the world. It has to defend an impracticable frontier in Egypt; another altogether untenable one in Afghanistan; and now by the occupation of Upper Burmah it has added to these a third frontier, as difficult to make good as those in Egypt and Afghanistan, and even more remote from its base of supply.

R. D. Osborn, Lieutenant-Colonel.

Correspondence.

THE MARYLAND APPOINTMENTS AGAIN.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Your correspondent, signing himself "Civil-Service Reform Democrat," evidently does not understand the political situation in Maryland. He thinks we are like the "man who called on Hercules instead of putting his own shoulder to the wheel," and counsels us to emulate Tilden, whose first service to reform was the forensic effort which secured to Azariah Flagg the office of which the "Rasins" and "Higginses" of his day sought to deprive him by fraudulent returns.

Let me tell your correspondent *some* of the things we are doing, and then see whether we can be charged with not trying to help ourselves, or with unfair criticism of the President's action in reference to the Maryland appointments.

1. The Reform League, through its Committee on Elections, has secured indictments against twelve persons for violating the Election Laws, and among these are five of the city registers. The Committee are prosecuting their investigations with thoroughness, and expect to procure testimony sufficient to indict at least half of the twenty registers of voters in this city. The mass of evidence already in hand against the indicted registers and their co-conspirators is overwhelming, and ought to render their conviction certain, but every lawyer knows how difficult it is to convict a political offender who is supported by the holders of all the State and municipal offices of a large city like Baltimore. It becomes especially difficult under a jury system which allows a score of peremptory challenges to each accused. Our task of thus emulating Mr. Tilden is not rendered easier by President Cleveland's appointing to office the very parties who engineered a fraudulent registration that deprives thousands of men in this city of their votes.

In four wards, 1,497 names were stricken from the list of voters by the indicted registers, and in only fifty-five cases was the law complied with. In the Twelfth Ward, among those stricken from the list, in violation of law, are the names of 221 persons, with the entry of "Lost residence," or "Lost his residence," opposite these names, and, strange to say, *all these with that entry are colored voters*, and a large proportion of them, at the time of the registration, had been living for years at the same place and had been legal voters at the preceding election. The registration book of this ward for the term of the indicted register shows six different handwritings therein, although the register is not by law allowed a clerk. Need I add that this registration book, of which the register under the law was the sole custodian, was every evening during the registration regularly carried to the house of Morris A. Thomas, President Cleveland's appointee as Indian Inspector, and kept in his house over night? We are doing our best to send these obliging friends of Mr. Thomas to the penitentiary, and if, for reasons I have given, we do not convict on the first indictment, we are prepared to indict again and again.

All this work, except, of course, drawing the indictments, has been done, and the evidence obtained and classified, at private expense, without the aid of a single State or city officer, and with no help from the detective agencies employed by the State and city to ferret out crimes. So much for court action, whose efforts as a reform political agency your correspondent so highly appreciates.

2. The Reform League, through its Committee on Legislation, has prepared and submitted to the Legislature the best Registration and Election

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Law ever presented to the Legislature of a State. They have improved upon the New York and Chicago laws, each of which is a model and evidently the work of a master hand. The "bosses," however, have given the word to defeat this law; and the man who will secure this result is I. Freeman Rasin, the lately appointed Naval Officer of Baltimore.

3. The Reform League, through its Committee on Officers, has gathered and submitted to the Senate of the United States the facts concerning some of the more notorious Federal appointments, and is now engaged in collecting the facts with reference to some of the recent ones.

4. By the courage of some good men in the State Senate, three iniquitous schemes concocted by Rasin and Gorman have been defeated. There could be no more striking illustration of the character of the ring we have to contend with than these bills. To one unacquainted with Maryland politics they would appear to be measures having no political significance at all. There is a bill for the calling of a constitutional convention. The acknowledged purpose of this is to get rid of the independent judiciary in the city. Mr. Rasin has always been able to guarantee his subordinates immunity in the courts; but in 1883 we succeeded in driving from their places the judges that had allowed their courts to be so used. We then elected a judiciary that has given great satisfaction. This has made it more difficult, though not impossible, for Mr. Rasin's men to secure acquittal, and the avowed purpose of the constitutional convention is to remove these judges. Another bill, part of the same scheme, would take away from the city judges the selection of the grand and petit juries and put it into the hands of the Sheriff, the purpose being the same—to secure safety in the Criminal Court. Supplementary to these bills, and part of the same plan, is a bill doing away with our present Police Board, they having refused at the last election to allow the police force to be used by Mr. Rasin in the election, and prevented the Marshal of Police from holding his office while running for Clerk of Court.

Our ring, you will thus see, is not an easy one to fight, and, when necessary for its uses, not only makes the statutes, but is now grasping after the organic law of the State. These bills seem for the present to have been beaten in the Senate, the plan being too palpable, but it has been done by the delegations from the counties, the city delegation voting for them unanimously.

5. By private subscription, a newspaper, the *Civil-Service Reformer*, has been established to advocate the cause of reform. Its vigorous articles are the gratuitous contributions of writers who have only a public interest in securing decent political methods.

These instances will illustrate a few of the ways in which we are "putting our own shoulders to the wheel." Now for the criticism of the President. I, as an Independent Democrat, agree with your correspondent that no President has ever given closer or more conscientious attention to the discharge of his responsible duties, including the making of appointments, than Cleveland. But he has made mistakes—grave mistakes in Maryland. And what did we do? Not, what your correspondent intimates, "blame" the President for every appointment that was unfit to be made. Take the first case, that of Higgins. After his appointment by Mr. Manning, we laid before the President and the Secretary the facts as to Higgins's character and deeds, and stated publicly that we did *not* blame either for this bad appointment, and that we knew that Senator Gorman had deceived them both. I presume that neither Mr. Manning nor the President can now have much doubt that Higgins burned our ballots in 1875, altered the Poll and Registration-books in 1879, and in 1880 commended the notorious burglar, "Billy Forrester," to a Philadelphia judge as "an honest man that followed the sea." Notwithstanding this, the Secretary appointed another equally disreputable person, "Sonny Mahon," to a position in the Custom-house. Again we believed the Secretary had been deceived, though we thought the Higgins lesson should have taught him not to honor all of Gorman's drafts at sight.

Next came the President's appointment of Thomas as Indian Inspector. We did not "blame" the President for this appointment. On the contrary, we told him he had been deceived again by Gorman, and proved before the Interior Department, by the witnesses who caught him at it, that Thomas, while an officer of election, had stuffed the ballot-box, and that he was a fraudulent bankrupt.

In the Independent campaign last fall every speaker on the reform side exonerated Cleveland, and we took particular pains to show that he had been deceived by our own representative in the Senate of the United States. There are no more enthusiastic supporters of Cleveland's policy than the people who entered into that campaign, nor any who believe more absolutely in his sincerity of purpose. What lent special bitterness to that campaign was the humiliation felt by the respectable people in this State at knowing that, when better political methods and a policy of reform were being inaugurated by Cleveland in other parts of the country, Maryland alone should be given over to the spoils system, and that our senior Senator at Washington, himself a product of that system, should be its most unblushing advocate by his acts and his utterances. We have believed in Cleveland, and still do. We have a guarantee of his purpose in his action elsewhere, and we know, better even than people outside, how difficult it must be for him to deal with a Senator with whom office-broking has been a life-work. What we have tried to do has been to give to Cleveland all possible light that we could upon the state of things here and the people who were abusing his confidence. Our position has been a hard one, and the whole story of Mr. Gorman's appointments has not been told. There have been numerous minor appointments by the heads of departments at Washington, attracting no notice, unknown to the President, unknown even to the heads of departments. Many of these appointments are made from the criminal class of this city. The indictments against them are still found on our court dockets. Their offences are known to the whole community.

But other mistakes of this kind sink into insignificance when compared with the appointment of Mr. I. Freeman Rasin as Naval Officer. It is impossible to give an outsider an idea of the shock that this produced among decent people here. It is impossible for Mr. Cleveland to have any idea of the man he was selecting. I. Freeman Rasin (or "Free" Rasin, as he is better known) is a notorious lobbyist. It has been his custom to send for any one who had a matter pending before the City Council, and notify him of the price at which the measure could get through. If the price was paid, it went through, otherwise not. There has been no secret about his method, and witnesses are readily forthcoming. In the matter of election frauds, Mr. Rasin has been accustomed to tell, with great freedom, how these frauds have been done by his people, and to give minute details. Abundant testimony can be procured as to this also. But it is not in either of these rôles that Mr. Rasin has made his great reputation. So far as organization is possible among the criminal classes of this city, Mr. Freeman Rasin is the leader and responsible head of our criminal class. At one time before the war, this city was known as "Mob Town," because of the violence at elections. Shooting and stabbing affrays at the polls always occurred. Mr. Rasin was the President and Manager of the "Ashland Club," whose members called themselves and were known in the city as the "Bloodtubs." It was by these gentlemen that the violence that I have spoken of was committed. The assassination of a man named Kyle by these men at an election in 1858 was characterized by such evident premeditation, and was so cold-blooded in its execution, that it aroused the whole city, and enabled the same gentlemen who are now prominent in the reform movement here to drive Mr. Rasin from power. Can any one be surprised that we object to such an appointment?

What the city is most anxious about now, however, is the appointment of United States Marshal, which Mr. Rasin is anxious to secure, through Mr. Gorman, for some one of his men. We certainly think that this, being a semi-judicial office, is one where the sentiment of the bar of this city should be consulted. Our bar is practically unanimous in favor of the reform movement here, and are nearly all members of the Reform League. About a dozen lawyers, good and bad, but all badly "ring streaked," are all that remain with the regular party. We certainly hope that President Cleveland will not put the office of United States Marshal, with its important duties and high responsibilities, in the hands of a creature of Mr. Rasin.

Certainly, in using every effort to prevent such a calamity, we do not wish to antagonize Mr. Cleveland. In fact, the feeling that the Reform party in Maryland has had for Mr. Cleveland through all this trying period, can be best expressed by the text so aptly quoted by Russell Lowell: "Though he slay us, yet will we trust in him." We hope, however, that he will not slay us, and that our confidence in him may soon be relieved from the strain to which it has been subjected.

BALTIMORE CIVIL-SERVICE REFORM DEMOCRAT.
March 2, 1886.

THE EXECUTIVE SESSIONS OF THE SENATE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the discussion of the issue now made between the President and the Senate with respect to the requests of that body for papers and information in relation to suspensions and removals from office, one weak point always noticed in the Senate's position is the fact that it proposes to act in secret, and without any fixed responsibility, on matters for which the President is directly responsible to the people. If it be true, as is contended, that the suspension of an official by a reform President necessarily involves a reflection on the character or competency of the person suspended, so would the reversal by the Senate in secret session of the action taken, especially if such reversal were presumptively based on a consideration of the Executive's reasons or grounds of action, be a reflection on the conduct of the President. The remedy generally proposed by those who desire better government is to throw open the doors of the Senate, and to bring the force of public opinion to bear on the consideration of executive business.

The objections to this course are worthy of the most careful consideration; and before suggesting any other remedy it will be well briefly to state them.

When the Senate sits to consider nominations for office its functions are not legislative, but executive. It forms to that extent a part of the Executive Department of the Government. It sits to execute the laws, not to make them; its duty is to act, not to debate. The consideration of appointments to office involves, it is true, more

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or less of discussion; but it is a different sort of discussion from that required for the performance of legislative acts. All who have had anything to do with legislation can appreciate how essential it is to intelligent action to obtain the views and suggestions of many minds as to the probable operation of almost any public measure that may be proposed. But the questions involved in the treatment of nominations are simple. Morality, practical morality, is a very simple thing. And it is not only simple, but it is *personal*. Should candidates for offices not immediately within the control of the people, or to be bestowed by the people, be compelled to submit to a public discussion of their character? And would publicity be favorable to the proper discussion of character?

Whether it would be so or not, the fact is that it is never the custom to require of the executive department of Government, State or national, any statement of reasons for such an act as an appointment to office, or, what would be strange indeed, any public expression of views as to the character and qualifications of the persons appointed. It is deemed a sufficient safeguard that the appointing power is *responsible* for its *acts* to the people.

In our national Government, however, we have under the present practice the anomalous spectacle of responsibility and irresponsibility at different stages in the performance of one complete act. The President's responsibility is fixed when a nomination is announced. But the Senate, which completes the appointment, acts with closed doors, and nobody is responsible for what it does. The remedy for this would be to require all *votes* on nominations to be taken in *public session*. There need be no public dissection of private character, in which a few Senators might enjoy indulging, but from which sensitive men would naturally shrink. But the responsibility of Senators for unfit confirmations would be ascertained. And all bargaining for confirmations and for the division and control of patronage could easily be detected and would be remorselessly exposed. If Mr. Senator—— secured the confirmation of a characterless politician whose nomination he had procured, the open vote would show from whom he got his support. And it is believed that this would go a long way toward the correction of abuses which have flourished for a long time because individual responsibility for them could not be determined.

J. B. M.

Washington, March 5.

TENURE OF OFFICE.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Both the President and the Senate, in their existing contest concerning removals from office, have taken positions antagonistic to the principle that public officers should be secure in their places during efficiency. If the President's claim, that he has the right to remove all officers of the United States without assigning reasons or in any manner accounting for his action, be well founded, no officer, so far as he is a public officer, can be said to live under a government of laws and not of men. His tenure is limited by the irresponsible will of one man, not by his own duly ascertained efficiency. The military service has been supposed to be the most arbitrary, but in that service no officer can be cashiered in time of peace without trial. The Senate is understood to be ready to withdraw all opposition to the President's action if he will avow that he has removed officers from an improper motive, namely, because they are not members of his political party. The establishment of the position of either party would be deplorable.

Tenure in office during efficiency can be secured by the enactment of a statute providing that public officers shall be removed from office only for cause, to be ascertained by a tribunal, for the organization of which our courts-martial supply a convenient model. Such a statute would be constitutional. The President's right to remove officers rests upon the People's grant of power to him by the words, "The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America" (Const., Art. 2, sec. 1). The reasonable interpretation of these words is that the President is given power *to execute* the laws, not to override them. The President properly makes removals as part of his duty to execute the laws of the land, but he does so subject to statutory regulation. Russell H. Curtis.

Chicago, March 4, 1886.

THE TWO SYSTEMS.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: If the English system of individual and responsible leadership is a good thing, the dependence of the Ministry upon Parliament is a very bad thing. The only executive power consists of a number of members of Parliament who agree to work together so long as they can command a majority upon every question. It is what is called in physics a condition of unstable equilibrium. They must hold each other up, and all their energies must first of all be spent in keeping their majorities It seems, at first sight, wholly inexplicable that enough Tories do not vote with the Liberals, or enough Liberals with the Tories, to teach Mr. Parnell that he cannot, with his handful of followers, rule the British Parliament. But inasmuch as strict party discipline is the only way of getting a Ministry into power, the party traditions are too strong to admit of temporary independence. Englishmen are mortally afraid, and with good reason, of the "groups" which work so much mischief on the Continent. But this effect of the "groups" results from the fact that the parliamentary systems of the Continent, at least as regards France and Italy, are based upon the English model. As long as there are no stable party majorities, there can be no stable ministries.

In this country the case is entirely different. It is the only one (of those which we need to consider) where a single ruler is elected by a practically direct vote of the whole nation, and is therefore wholly independent of Congress. The Cabinet are his lieutenants, not mere voluntary associates tempted by an agreement of mutual support, but subject to his directions. There is no reason why they should resign upon an adverse vote of Congress, or why, if any one of them resigned, all should do so. The houses have passed resolutions of inquiry of Mr. Manning and Mr. Whitney, and those gentlemen have made response to the committees. For reasons which have been pointed out *ad nauseam*, and which indeed are obvious enough, it would be infinitely more effective if this work were all done in public session; and there is no more reason why the Cabinet should resign upon political differences then than now. As party majorities could not turn out the Cabinet, party discipline would not be the first object, and an independent vote would not be regarded as equal to high treason. Policies, instead of being subject, as in England, to the chance of a moment, and that of each department to every other, would have a fair degree of permanence, and while Congress would not dare to refuse the means of carrying on the Government, it could by protests and speeches educate the people to any desired change.

It is said that the improved position of the Cabinet would detract from that of the President. But the Cabinet, not being responsible to Congress, would still be responsible to him and through him to the nation. He could support them while he thought best, or, if he found any of them seriously out of harmony with Congress or public opinion, could ask for his resignation. His position would be one of the most dignified in the world.

We have taught Europe many things, and, in spite of their sneers at our Presidential system, it may well be that in this respect also we can show them more than is dreamed of in their philosophy. G. B.

Boston, February 22, 1886.

THE ACTING SPEAKER OF THE REICHSTAG.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The writer of the interesting paragraphs upon the procedure of the German Reichstag (*Nation*, No. 1074, p. 79) says very justly that "at almost every point the procedure contrasts with that to which we are accustomed," and this strangeness of the system he was examining may easily account for a slight error into which he has fallen. I refer to the qualifications of the acting Speaker, "the oldest member of the House," who presides over a newly elected Parliament until an organization has been effected. The error consists in the conjecture that "oldest" is to be interpreted as meaning "the oldest in service." On the contrary, the word is to be taken literally: this honorable office falls to the oldest in years. It may be reasonably assumed that such a rule as this would hardly have been invented fifteen years ago for the brand-new Imperial Parliament; as a matter of fact, it was found ready to hand in the procedure of existing legislative bodies in Germany. A brief extract from a newspaper report of the first sitting—on January 14 — of the recently organized Prussian Landtag may be of interest:

"Immediately after the close of the opening ceremonies in the White Saloon of the royal palace the representatives gathered in the legislative chamber (*Sitzungssaal*). The attendance was unusually large, so that the House was competent to transact business. At twenty minutes before two o'clock the oldest member of the House, Landrath von Lessing, took the chair (*besteigt den Präsidentenstuhl*) and declared that he was born on November 14, 1809. No one announcing himself as having been born at an earlier date, Representative von Lessing assumed control of the House as President by seniority (*Alterspräsident*) in the following words. . . ."

His speech was commendably brief; after four short sentences, he called for cheers for the Emperor and King: "Er lebe hoch!" Three times the assembly shouted *Hoch!*

It will be noted that the opening of the Landtag by the King in person took place in the royal palace, while the English sovereign is received by the Lords and Commons in the Parliament House. But instead of attempting to attach any deep political significance to this difference, it may be enough to say that the building in which the Landtag sits is hardly suitable to the splendors of such a ceremony. G. H. Harrower.

Berlin, February, 1886.

THE PROHIBITION ARGUMENT EXTENDED.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Will you oblige a reader of the articles "Indemnity for Prohibition" and "The Prohibition Fallacy," by continuing the argument used to answer to the illustrations of "gas companies," "tariff," and "butchers," so that it will apply to "the Emancipation Proclamation," "opium dens," and "lotteries"?—Respectfully,

Inquirer.

Bordentown, N. J.

[With pleasure. The Emancipation Procla-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mation was avowedly a "war measure," and therefore compensation was no more due under it to the owners of slaves than to the surviving relatives of slain Confederate soldiers. But compulsory emancipation in time of peace without compensation would have been confiscation—a fact recognized in the British abolition of slavery in the West Indies. The consumption of opium has never obtained the general recognition or approval of any civilized community, as that of wine and whiskey has. That is, even the moderate use of opium is in all civilized countries regarded as a vice. Lotteries have been forbidden as a form of gambling, which has also everywhere been regarded as a vice, although sometimes resorted to by individuals for love of excitement, or governments when very hard up. The pretence that lotteries have ever occupied the position in the civilized world, as an occupation or industry, that the production and sale of intoxicating drinks have, is, in fact, to us one of those painful quibbles which seem to have an undying attraction for the Prohibitionist mind.—Ed. Nation.]

OUR FUTURE INDIAN POLICY.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Among the various plans proposed for use in making up the Indian policy of the present Administration, the most important are those of General Sheridan, Mr. Holman, and Mr. Dawes.

General Sheridan would give to each Indian family a half section of land, condemn the remainder of the reservation, and sell it to the United States at $1.25 per acre. The proceeds of the sale he would invest in Government securities to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States, the income to be used for the education and support of the Indians unto whom the land belonged, the sale of which created the fund. The General has shown that such a policy would create larger incomes for the various tribes, as a rule, than they now receive from the United States in annuities and other ways, and that the support of the Indians by this method would come really from their own property, instead of, as now, from the United States. His plan would, therefore, result in the saving of the several millions of dollars which now go annually to the support of the Indians. Besides, the adoption of this plan would, as he says, throw the greater part of the lands now held as reservations into the market, and open it up to settlers, and so improve the country.

Mr. Holman's plan has not at the present writing been so far made public as to show what it will be in full. But on one point he is reported to have announced himself as having convictions and courage. He would gather up the scattered bands and remnants of tribes and mass them on the large reservations, sell the abandoned reservations, and use the proceeds for the benefit of the Indians.

Mr. Dawes's Senate bill provides, among other things, that the United States shall patent the various reservations to the Indians now occupying them, but shall hold the patents in trust for twenty-five years; that when the President thinks it advisable he can have the reservations, or portions of them, allotted to the Indians in severalty, each person receiving 160 or 80 acres; that the United States shall issue to the individual Indians patents for their land, but shall retain them in trust for twenty-five years, at the end of which period the Indians shall receive patents therefor in fee discharged of the trust; that after the allotment has been made, the United States, with the consent of the Indians, may purchase the lands not allotted, paying therefor $1.25 per acre, which price shall be deposited in the Treasury on interest at 5 per cent. per annum, the income to be expended for the education and other needs of the Indians, and that every Indian born in the territorial limits of the United States, to whom an allotment has been made under this act, "is hereby declared to be a citizen of the United States, and is entitled to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of such citizens."

Looking at these several plans, one must admit a thorough sincereness of purpose to do the best thing possible for the Indian in them all. But while General Sheridan's method, if carried out, would make every Indian a gentleman or lady of leisure for the entire term of his and her natural life, it would certainly be the very worst possible thing for the Indians. To plant a family on a half-section which is to be its home as long as the family remain tenants of the earth, is to put them in jail. Besides, if the Indians are to become self-supporting farmers and stock-raisers, a half-section to a family is only a chicken-pen or a hog-yard. There must be room allowed for increase of population in the family, and there must be land enough to afford farms for all until the Indians have become so far like whites in their knowledge and skill that there will no longer be any need of lines of protection, and until whites and Indians, mingling together by natural desire, shall have solved the Indian problem by the laws of nature and the method of miscegenation, for wherever the Indians get a fair chance to obtain the advantages of education they will remove every particle of prejudice against intermarriage. I could name many men and women to-day in Michigan who are the descendants of Indian mothers, and who are among the most successful and honored families of the State. Within twenty-five years numbers of men and women came from the cities of Detroit and Saginaw to the Isabella Indian Reservation and proved themselves Chippewa Indians, and drew annuities and obtained patents for lands from the United States, who had been for years moving among the best families of those places.

But now General Sheridan's plan would make the Indians dependent upon their moneys or bonds invested in the United States Treasury. It would virtually make them paupers subsisted on public charity, for though they should be rich yet their riches would be forever withheld from them, and they would be fed like charity patients from a Government table. It would remove all need of efforts at self-support, and so would put an end to all possibility of making them self-supporting.

Besides, the worst evil the Indians have had to endure has been the presence of bad white men among them or sneaking about them, as wolves hang around a sheepfold. The chief reason why the Isabella Indians in Michigan are not to-day prosperous farmers and rich men is, that they were harassed and ruined by white scoundrels. Let it be known that the Indians of any tribe are henceforth to become the recipients of lands or moneys in their own right to any considerable extent, and there will at once gather around them a gang of white men whose actions and conduct would not be tolerated in any honestly civilized community in the world. Such men, the jackals and hyenas of humanity, are always on the watch for an opportunity to rob some one, and as the Indians are by far the easiest victims to be found on this continent, and especially as they are the recipients of moneys justly due them from the United States for lands that they have from time to time ceded thereto, it follows that these men look upon the Indians as their best source of income. To carry out General Sheridan's plan would put more money into the hands of the Indians and thereby increase the temptations for the white thief, and so augment the dangers of the Indians and hurry their ultimate ruin and extermination. What the Indian needs is not money, but what money will bring him as long as his money is safe. That is, it should not be placed in his hands until he has first learned what it is and the proper use it serves in the world. To teach an Indian how to raise cattle and convert them into money, how to raise grain and convert it into money, is to save him. To support him in idleness is to lose him, soul and body and race. Anything that will make him work and work understandingly will be a good. Anything that will bring him into contact with evil-minded white men will help to ruin him. The less money, then, the better. Give him honest, practical farmers and mechanics to show him how to work, and equally honest, common-sense teachers to instruct him in his schools; make his surroundings moral throughout; let his religious training enforce upon him the great importance of honesty, truthfulness, industry, and chastity, and above all compel white rascals to keep away from him, and his success is just as certain as it is that he belongs to the human race.

For these reasons I do not think General Sheridan's plan a good one. Of Mr. Holman's plan, as far as known, to mass the remnants of tribes and scattered bands, I think well. Here in Michigan the Isabella reservation was ceded to Chippewa Indians only, but white men, anxious to increase the number of Indians receiving lands in severalty, sent half-breeds all over the State and into Canada to get other Indians to come upon this reservation and claim lands. It was the same game that the Cherokee Roberts is said to have been playing in Canada the present winter to get more Indians in the Indian Territory preparatory to an allotment of those lands in severalty. Well, the result of the work was that there are here now representatives of half-a-dozen different tribes all welded together by consanguinity and living in harmony. The same thing would result, in my opinion, were the scattered bands and small tribes brought together further west; and when Indians have learned to be harmonious among themselves they have come a long way toward learning that it is best for them to live in harmony with the whites also. Such a plan would, for instance, come as a savior to this remnant of starving, pauperized Indians on this Isabella reservation in Michigan. They can do nothing for themselves, and if left here will in a few years be exterminated. But they have yet about 10,000 acres of land, all of which the whites there are waiting to steal as soon as it is allotted to them in severalty. That land is worth $5, much of it $10, per acre. If sold for the benefit of these Indians, the proceeds would go far toward giving them a new start in the world in a land where they could forget the wrongs they have suffered in Michigan. I think, therefore, that this plan should be added to the many careful provisions of Mr. Dawes's bill.

The Senate bill is certainly a strong one as a protection for the Indians. But if it were to make the period of trusteeship fifty years instead of twenty-five, I think it would be fully 100 times as good as it now is. The thing to be accomplished is to civilize the Indians and make them self-supporting, self-protecting citizens, who shall take their place among citizens in general and be absorbed by the conglomerate citizenship which has come to us from all parts of the world. What are the chief obstacles to the accomplishment of such a purpose? The inherited race customs of life and the dishonesty of the white men who come in contact with the Indians. Secretary Lamar says the Indian must make his final stand where he is, and either adapt himself to civilization or be annihilated. But

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his environment is not white civilization, but the scum and vice of civilization. The whites who hang upon the Indians where there is anything to steal from them are men who would not be tolerated among respectable people, and it is this terrible evil to which the Indian must adapt himself or be exterminated. That is, he must learn how to protect himself against it; and until he has learned that lesson he must be protected. Whether it takes 25, 50, or 100 years makes no difference in the duty that is laid upon the United States. It was this evil power of the mean and scoundrel whites who gathered about the Chippewas on the Isabella Reservation in Michigan twenty-five years ago that made the honest effort of the United States to help those Indians of no avail. But in twenty-five years the character of the men who still watch these Indians for opportunities to rob them has not changed. They are bad men still, though out of their ill-gotten gains several of them have tried to buy a good name and bribe God Almighty by building and supporting churches! The Indians will be surrounded by human wolves and jackals twenty-five years hence out West just as they were here twenty-five years ago, and they will not be safe until the civilization to which we would have them adapt themselves in order to prevent their extermination has itself been civilized, until from the Lakes to the Gulf, from Cape Cod to California, no man shall dare to wrong another, when race and color prejudices shall have been lost in the grander recognition of the rights of man, and man shall mean all mankind.

CHARLES ELLIS.

EAST SAGINAW, MICHIGAN.

THE DEPRECIATION OF THE GOLD DOLLAR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It seems a little remarkable, in view of former acts of Congress upon the subject, that a suggestion has not yet been made to adjust the relative values of gold and silver coin by depreciating the gold dollar.

The Act of April 2, 1792, provided that the relative values of silver and gold should be as 15 to 1, and that both should circulate as money when coined by the Government in conformity with this standard.

In 1823 the Secretary of the Treasury called the attention of Congress to the fact that gold had appreciated in value so that an ounce of it was worth 16 ounces in silver (Cong. Debates, February 6, 1823, p. 859), and that this appreciation of gold had resulted in the very evils that are now apprehended, to wit, the silver had driven the gold out of circulation. It was publicly asserted, in fact, that in 1834 there was hardly a gold piece to be found in the whole United States (Cong. Debates, June, 1834, p. 4654).

To meet this evil the standard was corrected by making the legal value of gold and silver conform to their actual value in the markets of the world. *This result was accomplished, however, by depreciating the value of the gold dollar* (Act June 28, 1834), and not, as is now proposed, by raising the value of silver coins—out of regard, presumably, for the debtor class (Cong. Debates, June 21, 1834, p. 4650, *et seq.*). And after the discovery of gold in California, the relative values of gold and silver were again disturbed by the depreciation of gold. It was again proposed to adjust the matter by diminishing the weight of a silver dollar. And the fractional currency was actually depreciated (Oct., 1851), although to a very slight extent. The disastrous consequences of such a policy are, of course, easily apparent. If, in the event of fluctuation in the value of either of the precious metals, the more valuable be depreciated, ultimately a dollar will be worth nothing. But I think it is equally absurd to attempt to correct inevitable variations by increasing the weight of the cheaper. Some other course must be adopted so long as both gold and silver are retained in circulation.

Respectfully yours,

I. H. LIONBERGER.

ST. LOUIS, March 2, 1886.

AN OVER-PRAISED TRANSLATOR.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: What can Mr. Evelyn Abbott mean by praising as he does Miss Alleyne's translations from Zeller's great work on Greek Philosophy? In the preface to the recently published English edition of Zeller's small compendium on the same subject, the 'Outlines of the History of Greek Philosophy,' Mr. Abbott says: "She [Miss Alleyne] knew the value of accuracy, and was at great pains to secure it. She had also a keen sense of literary style, and would turn a sentence three or four times before she could be satisfied with it. Hence the excellence of her work as a translator."

I have recently read a good deal of her translation in two volumes of the first division of Zeller's larger work ('The Pre-Socratic Philosophy'). These volumes were published in 1881, five years after she had brought out, in conjunction with Prof. Alfred Goodwin, an English version of the second division ('Plato and the Older Academy'). She was therefore no novice at the time. The measure of her success may be judged by a few specimens culled from the pages I have last read, viz., vol. ii, pp. 407-445. Besides minor inaccuracies, such as "copied" for *abstrahirt*, and "ancient philosophers" for *ältere Philosophen*, I have noticed in these pages the following extraordinary blunders:

Im übrigen ist uns von seinem Leben nichts bekannt (p. 946).	Of his doctrine nothing is known to us (p. 411).
die Aussicht . . . ist es vor allem, was sie der Jugend ihrer Zeit als unentbehrliche Führer erscheinen lässt (p. 975).	it is the prospect . . . which they, as indispensable guides, hold out before everything else to the youth of the period (p. 441).
so haben sich die bedeutendsten Sophisten auch ausdrücklich darüber erklärt, und die übrigen haben es wenigstens durch ihr ganzes Verfahren an den Tag gelegt, dass sie sich von der älteren Philosophie lossagen (p. 977).	yet the most important of the Sophists never expressly declared, and the rest only implied by their general procedure, that they had broken with the previous philosophy (p. 444).

If it were worth while, I could produce from other parts of the book still more remarkable mistakes, but *ex pede Herculem*. The truth is, this translation is about as bad as such work usually is. One who attempts to read it comes every now and then upon some senseless passage which proves, on reference to the original, to turn the author's meaning topsy-turvy. A reader who does not know German, or who has not the original at hand, must often get into a sad muddle.

FRANK B. TARBELL.

YALE COLLEGE, NEW HAVEN, CONN., February 23, 1886.

MR. FITZEDWARD HALL AND THE NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The reviewer of the English Philological Society's Dictionary, at page 103, *ante*, after acknowledging that he is "generally impressed with the accuracy of the work" as regards its "treatment of American usage," goes on to say: "We shall probably not be far out of the way in supposing that this state of things must be due largely to the supervision of" myself. And then follow some rather severe strictures. For the shortcomings which the reviewer points out I am not, however, responsible in any manner or degree, his conjecture as to my "supervision" being wholly gratuitous. I have not supplied Dr. Murray, for the entire alphabet, with matter equal to that of one of your columns bearing on Americanisms. In reading the proof-sheets of the Dictionary, I have, further, paid next to no attention to anything distinguished by the letters U. S. The subject of Americanisms is one by which, as a whole, I am much more repelled than attracted, and with which I have none but the most superficial acquaintance. It could not well be otherwise, seeing that I have been forty years away from home and that I know very little of American literature.

Your obedient servant, F. HALL.

MARLESFORD, ENGLAND, February 16, 1886.

[Our reference to Dr. Hall was intended to be entirely complimentary, as the context shows. It implied (mistakenly, as now appears) rather that he had saved the work from all but a small measure of inaccuracy, than that he was responsible for the shortcomings which we pointed out, and which unavoidably in the review took on proportions greater by far than they have in the work itself.—ED. NATION.]

MR. PAGE ON YALE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: For the benefit of such readers of the *Nation* as are not familiar with the matter, I should like to call attention to one or two misleading statements in Mr. Page's recent letters. In his first table he compares the academical departments of Yale and Harvard. This seems fair at first sight, but, since Harvard has practically united the Lawrence Scientific School to the college proper by throwing open most of the courses to the academic students, this comparison gives her an undue advantage. Students will attend the College for a scientific education to gain the other benefits which the College offers, to say nothing of the éclat of a degree of B.A. Under these circumstances it is hardly fair to omit mention of the flourishing Sheffield Scientific School, which contains about ten times as many students as the Lawrence School at Harvard.

The same point deserves attention in presenting the courses offered in the two institutions. Harvard has thrown open to her undergraduates many of the courses of the Divinity School, besides those of the Scientific School above mentioned. In Mr. Page's tables, then, we have the teaching force of three Harvard departments pitted against that of one department in Yale. It is true that the Harvard undergraduate has these additional advantages, which was Mr. Page's point; yet at the same time it gives an unfair notion of the resources of Yale to make such a comparison. If Mr. Page is so earnest a Yale man, it seems as if he should not have neglected to caution his readers against misjudgment. Tables comparing the amount of the instruction given by Yale's Academic, Scientific, and Theological faculties with Mr. Page's figures for Harvard would present a much better appearance and be a fairer exhibition of her powers.

Mr. Page is of opinion that Yale has advantages of situation over Harvard, because she is not so near a "great and wicked city." But can it not be said that Harvard has a great advantage over Yale in being near a great literary centre, a city proverbial for the devotion of its inhabitants to literature?

Mr. Page gives two great reasons for the expansion of Harvard—that she is governed by her alumni, and that she has completely adopted the optional system. Mr. Page distinctly implies that the Harvard Overseers correspond to the Yale Corporation. Such is the natural interpretation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What are the facts? Harvard is governed by a far closer corporation than is Yale. The Yale Corporation is composed of the President, the Governor of Connecticut, ten self-elected clergymen of the State, and six graduates, elected by the alumni. Harvard is governed by a self-electing corporation of seven—the President, the Treasurer, and five other gentlemen. A quorum for the transaction of business is made by the President and three of the Fellows, provided the others have been warned of the meeting. The college property is held and managed entirely by the Corporation. The Overseers ordinarily have no voice in the investment or disposition of funds, but their consent is necessary in matters relating to the statutes, regulations, appointments, and internal administration of the College. The graduates have no direct hand in the management of the funds. Harvard College, in short, is governed by a small self-electing body, held responsible to the Board of Overseers elected by the graduates. It will be seen that the graduates of Yale have a much larger direct share in the government of their alma mater than the Harvard graduates have. These facts are found in the opening pages of the Harvard Catalogue.

In respect to elective studies, says Mr. Page:

"Yale stood till five or six years ago just where she stood in the eighteenth century, and stands to-day almost exactly where Harvard stood in 1841. Of course, the opportunities of choice are far greater at Yale to-day than they could be at any American college forty-five years ago; but they are still far inferior to the advantages which Cambridge now affords."

It would be difficult to combine more misrepresentation in so short a space. In the first place, Mr. Page seems entirely ignorant that two extensions of the optional system have recently been made at Yale. In 1876 four hours a week of elective work were allowed juniors and seniors; in September, 1884, the first trial was made of the present system, which allows the juniors to choose eight-fifteenths and the seniors twelve-fifteenths of their work. But let us see what Harvard had in 1841, which Mr. Page says was almost exactly what Yale has now. The Harvard Catalogue of 1841 mentions certain electives without particulars, but in 1844 we find electives offered. The choice, however, was not given to the student, but to his parent or guardian; and if they failed to exercise it, the Faculty laid out a course as their own judgment dictated. As late as 1871 the Harvard seniors had five and a half hours of required work, against three hours now required at Yale. Mr. Page, for a Yale graduate, is commendably generous to the Harvard of forty-five years ago. His remark, "If elective studies are good, why were they not adopted years ago?" applies equally to Harvard if we go back fifteen years. Yale had the germ of the elective system as far back, at least, as 1821, the date of the earliest programme of studies that I know of, when for one term the juniors could choose between fluxions, Greek, and Hebrew. French was added to this list in 1825-6, Spanish in 1826-7, German in 1841-2, and Italian in 1845-6. At this time the seniors had a similar limited choice. The policy of the College has varied somewhat in this respect. Mr. Page should have informed himself on these matters before assuming that the optional system was unknown at Yale till five or six years ago.

To conclude with Mr. Page, it seems to me that he measures the two colleges too much by numbers, especially by the numbers of students that attend them. Is not that somewhat parallel to judging two authors by the number of readers they attract? The judgment may be correct and it may not. The popular patronage of a college proves much or little, however advantageous it may be, according to the popular standards of culture. Inasmuch as American standards are too often sadly utilitarian, the popular judgment of a theory of education may easily be somewhat untrustworthy. Oberlin has twice or three times as many students as Amherst. Is Oberlin better? It may be and may not be; only, numbers are not the final criterion. The graduate department at Johns Hopkins contains twice as many students as the Harvard department, though it is hardly ten years old. Is it that much better?

It seems to me that a very simple reason for the expansion at Harvard may be given in addition to the common ones. By relaxing all restrictions requiring fixed courses of study, she has taken a position filled by no other institution. Here is the oldest and most celebrated university in the land changing its character, offering opportunities of specialization hitherto out of the reach of the American student. Harvard stands in her new position practically without a competitor, while Yale, still preserving a curriculum somewhat like that of Amherst, Princeton, and others of our best colleges, competes with them. Obviously we should expect immense expansion at Harvard and only moderate growth at Yale. Yale has grown as rapidly as her sister institutions of her own kind. Suppose Yale to adopt the Harvard system, then Harvard would have one competitor and probably grow less rapidly. Yale could never reap as much as Harvard, since Harvard secured the first fruits. Whether it would be wise for Yale to attempt to follow Harvard in this respect is very much doubted. It is a grand thing to have Harvard offer the immense advantages she does, but it would be mischievous if she should be imitated by all the institutions in the land.

Another cause for Yale's slower growth deserves a word. She draws some sixty per cent. of her students from outside the State, a large proportion from the West. Now of late the Western colleges have been improving rapidly, and are competing with Yale more and more for this Western contingent. Harvard does not feel this competition so heavily because of her unique character. The fact that some ten per cent. of her undergraduates are special students, not studying for a degree, illustrates how her growth has been accelerated by entering a new field.

There are other points about the comparison instituted by Mr. Page which might be touched upon, but I believe enough has been said to show that his conclusions need to be taken with some allowance if one desires to form a fair estimate of the present position of Harvard and Yale.

EDWARD G. BOURNE.

NEW HAVEN, March 8, 1886.

Notes.

A FORTNIGHT ago we announced the undertaking of the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia College which will shortly be embodied in the *Political Science Quarterly*. A recent gift of $15,000 by Mr. John E. Thayer to Harvard University, to establish a publication fund in political economy, is, we learn, soon to be utilized after the foregoing example. The University will, at the opening of the next academic year, begin to publish at regular intervals a series of contributions to political and economic science. They will neither be limited as regards authorship to the work of members of the University, nor represent any particular economic school, or method, or set of ideas. Rather, according to its capacity, the series will be made a repository for anything in the way of discussion, investigation, or criticism which is believed likely to promote the study of the science and its literature. At this time we are unable to give any further details, except that what is contemplated is not a series of monographs. In other words, the publications of this kind at Johns Hopkins, Columbia, and Harvard will supplement, not rival, each other. Together they mark an epoch in the political education of the American people, and have a high and cheering significance.

Cupples, Upham & Co., Boston, will publish a limited parchment-bound edition of Mr. Rideing's 'Thackeray's London'; 'The Log of the *Ariel*'; and a new work from the German on 'Electric Lighting.'

D. C. Heath & Co. announce 'Systems of Education,' by Professor John Gill, of the Normal College, Cheltenham, England.

Johnson's 'Rasselas' and Lamb's 'Ulysses' will be added to their "Children's Classics" by Ginn & Co.

'Mrs. Peixada,' a new novel by "Sidney Luska," is announced for early publication by Cassell & Co., who have also in press 'No. XIII: The Story of the Lost Vestal,' by Emma Marshall.

The Chicago *University*, which has already absorbed three periodicals, is about to add to itself another, and will henceforth be known as *Unity and the University*.

Outing for March is the first issue under the direction of Mr. Poultney Bigelow and in New York. Mr. Bigelow's travels about the globe have well qualified him for the charge of this wholesome organ of outdoor life and sports. The present number is fully up to its high standard of literary and artistic excellence. We remark the usual instalment of Mr. Thomas Stevens's record of his extraordinary bicycling trip around the world.

The second (March) number of the *Academy* (Syracuse, N. Y.: George A. Bacon) confirms the impressions we derived from No. 1. Mr. Bacon manifests a strong editorial sense, a clear head, a modest and undogmatic spirit. It is already manifest, too, that this periodical meets a want, and has touched a responsive chord in those who are engaged in secondary instruction. Nor do we know of any other publication which would have been as fitting and natural a medium for the recent address, by President Adams, of Cornell, on "The Educational System of Germany," printed in full in the issue before us.

General Buell's paper on Shiloh in the current *Century* is reinforced by one on the same battle by Gen. W. F. Smith in the March number of the *Magazine of American History*. It stops short of the first day's fighting, and will doubtless have a sequel.

The February *Antiquary* (New York: D. G. Francis) is on the whole a light number, but none the less readable. It opens with "Stories of Noodledom," by W. A. Clouston—Gotham being apparently a principal town of Noodledom. "Quaint Conceits in Pottery," by Llewellyn Jewett, contains amusing cuts of "Sussex Pigs" and "Toby Fillpot." Other entertaining illustrations are found in a notice of Mr. Ashton's 'Dawn of the Nineteenth Century.' "The Black Assize at Oxford in 1577," by Dr. Frederick Pollard, is a valuable contribution to medical history. "Black Assize" is the name given to a session of court at which an epidemic of fever breaks out, caused by the filth and confinement of the jails. Dr. Pollard examines one of the most famous of these, with the aid of a plan of the locality. Mr. H. B. Wheatley commences a series of papers upon "Precious Stones" with an account of Pearls. Mr. Richard Davey has the opening article of a series on Beatrice Cenci, in which he makes use of the newly-discovered evidence in regard to her and her family. The present paper is devoted to showing the bad character, as well as inferior origin, of her father

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Francesco Cenci. Mr. A. Folkard, on "The Antiquity of Surnames," proves that surnames were in use in the Anglo-Saxon times. This, too, is to be continued. Other short papers are on "The Lord Mayor's Show in 1590," "Lewisham Wells," and "Newly-Discovered Fresco Paintings in an Old Danish Church."

Two substantial but likewise entertaining articles occupy the forefront of *Le Livre* for February. L. Derôme recites the origin and career of the first *Revue de Paris* (1829-1845), founded by the versatile Dr. Véron, whose *article de début*, written by Sainte-Beuve, was an attack on Boileau of which the writer grew less proud as he grew older. In the files of this Review one may see other beginnings equally instructive, and there is much evidence lurking in them concerning the literary history of the most famous Romanticists—Victor Hugo, Mérimée, Charles Nodier, etc., with Delacroix, Rossini, and Tony Johannot. M. de Saint-Heraye, on the other hand, treats of the first bibliographical journal, the *Annales Typographiques, ou Notice du progrès des Connoissances humaines* (Paris, 1759). In connection with a short-lived though really earlier periodical, the *Bibliothèque annuelle et universelle* of Burtin and the Abbé Ladvocat (1751-1753), M. de Saint-Heraye alludes to these editors as "les auteurs," apparently after the usage we lately pointed out as once prevalent in England, of addressing the Editor as the Author. We seem to see the same thing in a contemporary reference by the editor of *L'Année littéraire* (1759) to the plan of "l'auteur *des Annales typographiques*," where one might, to be sure, interpret *auteur* by 'founder'; and again, thus, "M. Morin (c'est le nom de l'auteur des *Annales typographiques*) a certainement beaucoup d'érudition. Il rapproche les ouvrages publiés sur la même matière," etc., where the editorial function is uppermost in the writer's mind. However, Littré does not record any such meaning under *auteur*. In the "Chronique du *Livre*" are printed some inedited verses by Alfred de Musset.

A list of 376 rivers, large and small, of all countries, with length, distance of mouth from source, and watershed areas, approximately estimated, is given in No. 120 of the Berlin Geographical Society's Journal. The Nile ranks first in length, the Mississippi second.

Mr. M. M. Ballou's 'Edge-Tools of Speech' (Ticknor & Co.) is a thick volume of nearly 600 pages, full of "elegant extracts," which will delight those who think the free use of them a mark of culture or of thought. Prose predominates, we should say, but the poetry is disguised by being printed as prose. Foreign authors are cited in translation. The compiler's range includes at one extreme Josh Billings, whose aphorisms are quite as good as those of more literary characters, and better than platitudes like this from William Howitt: "Whoever has not ascended mountains knows little of the beauties of Nature"; or this ordinary remark from Emerson: "We are disgusted with gossip"; or this stimulating "edge-tool of speech" from Cowley: "Merab's long hair was glossy chestnut brown." Mr. Howells is one of the latest laid under contribution, in this from 'Silas Lapham'—"It is certain that our manners and customs go for more in life than our qualities." The classification is sometimes forced, as when we find under Flirtation, "Who is it can read a woman?" It is often incomplete, as, after disposing of Originality, Mr. Ballou puts the same kind of texts under Plagiarism, with no cross-reference. The heading Woman, it would be safe to say, includes less than a quarter of the quotations in which the word occurs. To gather these together there is no index, nor is there any index of authors, though a useless list is given.

Beyond some half-dozen corrections in the ascriptions of poems, and the bringing down of biographical dates to 1884, and more tasteful typography and binding, we perceive nothing to remark in the new edition of Schaff and Gilman's 'Library of Religious Poetry' (Funk & Wagnalls), first published in 1880. It is a good and comprehensive collection, though the term "religious" is construed somewhat narrowly, as if a hymnology had been contemplated.

A very attractive book has been made by rendering into English Froebel's 'Mutter- und Kose-Lieder' ('Mother's Songs, Games, and Stories,' London: William Rice). The ladies, Frances and Emily Lord, who have done this, have of course preserved the pictures which are the basis of Froebel's object-lessons, though with a reduction in scale which somewhat impairs their usefulness; and they have rearranged the music for children's voices, with pianoforte accompaniment. The translators lay stress on the fact that this work, unlike others on the theory of education, puts a "distinctly prepared means" into the hands of those who have not a knack of inventing. That its value lies more in its suggestiveness than its "means" can be inferred from such rhymes as these, which a dime-novel could not surpass in unreality, though their motive is apparent and respectable:

"Though black the Charcoal Burners are in face,
Though grimy are their shirts, ill-shod their feet,
Their hearts are kind and warm, *and always beat*
For what is blameless, good, and right, in every place."

'Holly and Mistletoe, or Songs across the Snow, written and illustrated by E. T. G.' (Baltimore: Glass & Co.), is a seasonable production, especially as to the second part of the title. The illustrations, with their winter sparkle, and the whole getting up of the letter-press, are in taste and refined execution far above the usual holiday gift-books—if books they may be called that books are none, but rather a cross between Christmas cards and a portfolio. If we had leisure to read the songs—twenty-five in number, ten of them illustrated—we might judge whether "E. T. G." writes as well as she paints. Our trial with "Golden Rod," which we took by way of sample, was fairly encouraging.

Mr. B. F. Harding, teacher of Greek in St. Paul's School, Concord, N. H., is the author of a little book of forty-four pages on 'Greek Inflection' (Boston: Ginn & Co.). It has various objects in view, among them to "furnish a large number of words for ready use as paradigms," to "suggest a systematic and scientific treatment of the noun and verb," to be used "for parallel work with the grammar, . . . by the beginner as well as by the more advanced scholar or teacher," to "collect in small compass the latest developments of philology," on the subjects of case-endings, terminations, person-endings, and the inflection of the noun and verb generally, and "to form a stepping-stone between the school and comparative grammars." We shall leave our readers to judge of the success of an attempt to accomplish all this within the limits of about forty pages. The book is really an attempt to teach the inflection of the Greek noun and verb according to the "stem theory," by a new method which presents many points of originality and ingenuity. That the "stem theory" is destined to supplant all others in teaching Latin and Greek we have no doubt; but we do not think the manner in which it is here presented is the best. The book is, however, suggestive, and well worth the perusal of teachers, even though they may not adopt it for use in the class-room.

"Twenty-second thousand" must be inscribed on the new edition of the late Stephen S. Foster's famous anti-slavery tract, 'The Brotherhood of Thieves; or, a True Picture of the American Church and Clergy,' about to be issued by Mr. Parker Pillsbury of Concord, N. H.; the prior edition having been exhausted. We have before called attention to Mr. Pillsbury's inexpensive series of reprints, which includes also J. G. Birney's 'The American Churches the Bulwarks of American Slavery,' and Mr. Pillsbury's own 'The Church as It Is; or, the Forlorn Hope of Slavery'—all a part of the anti-slavery warfare of the forties, and a repository of irrefragable testimony as to the pro-slavery subserviency of churches and ministers of almost every denomination. Every public and every theological library should have them, and every student of the abolition agitation. A larger and recent work by Mr. Pillsbury, 'Acts of the Anti-Slavery Apostles,' whose field of retrospect is principally New Hampshire, and which has taken its place among the important memoirs of the period to which it relates, is likewise procurable of the author-publisher.

From the Government Printing-office we have Vol. 13 of the Census, being the Statistics and Technology of the Precious Metals, prepared, under the direction of Clarence King, by S. F. Emmons and G. F. Becker.

It is a pleasure to be able to declare that a book about a game of cards—most of which are a weariness to the flesh and a provocation to assault and battery—accomplishes exactly what it intends; and this can be declared of 'A Handbook of Whist and Ready Reference Manual of the Modern Scientific Game,' by "Major Tenace" (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons). It is a successful attempt to set forth dogmatically the proper play at any given condition of the game, leaving explanation and discussion to other works, which the genuine student of whist may be supposed to have in his possession.

Mr. Edward Roth, 1135 Pine Street, Philadelphia, makes slow but steady work with his index to *Littell's Living Age*. The biographical section ends in No. 8 at Lord John Russell.

The first report of the Art Students' League of New York, by the President, Mr. Frank Waller, is on our table. Its encouraging retrospect covers a period of ten years.

Mr. Christern has received the catalogue of the eighth exhibition of the French Water Color Society. Its illustrations are made to ornament the pages very effectively.

We have had occasion more than once to commend the admirably edited and neatly printed 'Nouvelle Bibliothèque Classique' of M. Jouaust, the latest issues of which are a four-volume Rabelais and a three-volume Bossuet. The new quarterly Bulletin of the Librairie des Bibliophiles now announces that there will soon be added Montaigne's Essays and a selection from the interminable writings of Voltaire. Another announcement from the same Bulletin is that M. Jouaust has now for sale most of the original drawings from which the etchings were made that have adorned the many beautiful books he has published in the past ten or twenty years.

One of the chief points in which Waitz's view of the development of the feudal system has heretofore failed of general acceptance has been his assertion that gifts of land by the Merovingian kings created only a limited and not a full right of property. This view has been received with general scepticism, especially by jurists, who have been unable to find any support for it in the legal ideas of the time. An important paper on the subject from the distinguished historian of law, Professor Brunner, has just appeared in the Transactions of the Berlin Academy (for December 17, 1885). He asserts that the reason given by Waitz for the inability of the jurists to accept his views, that they demand a doctrine to be fully developed before they can recognize its existence, is not the true one, but rather that the early adoption of the principles of the Roman law in regard to gifts of this sort has

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

induced jurists to overlook the scattered traces of earlier German ideas. He then proceeds to a study of the subject worthy to rank in some respects with the celebrated studies of Sickel in the Transactions of the Vienna Academy on the related subject of the Immunities. In this he attempts to recover from the usages of other Germanic nations, and from the scattered notices in Frankish diplomas, the standpoint of the early German law in regard to such gifts, and decides that the only satisfactory conclusion is that gifts of land from the Merovingian kings created only a limited right of property unless a full right is expressly granted. This is the more noteworthy as Brunner has heretofore maintained the opposite view, as in Holtzendorff's 'Encyclopädie,' 1882.

Halliwell-Phillipps writes to an American correspondent: "I am well aware of the two great defects in my 'Outlines' to which you allude, the want of a good index and of an account of the engravings. I had made considerable progress with both of them last spring when I was almost suddenly prostrated; and, feeling from what the doctor said that a long and absolute rest was a necessity, I preferred issuing the volume without them to deferring its publication for an indefinite period. As it was, though pretty well in general health, I was unable to do book-work all the summer, the examination of the records of two towns being pretty much all that I managed to get through with during upward of six months. If I have better luck this spring, these blemishes will, I hope, be removed. What I have left of literary ambition has been abundantly satisfied by the kind reception my book has met with in every direction, especially among American students—a reception that is stimulating me to do my best to add to its utility."

At Reykjavik, on January 21, died suddenly Bergur Thorberg, Governor-General of Iceland; or, as the Icelanders themselves style their highest official, "Landshöfdingi," or "Head of the Land." He was born at Hvanneyri, in the extreme north of the island, January 23, 1829, was educated at the University of Copenhagen, became a judge, and then Governor of the southern and western provinces; he was made acting Governor-General May 1, 1883, and received a year later the permanent appointment. He was the first native Icelander who, for many generations, filled the office, his immediate predecessor, Hilmar Finsen, being by birth a Dane, though a descendant of an Icelandic family. Governor Thorberg was a man of marked courtesy, of great honesty of purpose, and of ready eloquence. Those who have visited his library and seen his table covered with the principal reviews and literary journals of Scandinavia, Germany, and France, will bear testimony to his broad culture. His widow is a daughter of the island's venerable bishop, Dr. Pètur Pètursson. It is worthy of note that, two days after the decease of Governor Thorberg, news reached Reykjavik of the death at Copenhagen of the ex-Governor-General Finsen, who was at the head of the Icelandic Administration from 1865 to 1883, and who, after his resignation, became a member of the Danish Cabinet.

— *Lippincott's* for March is very agreeable reading. Fiction occupies the leading place, and Mr. Brander Matthews's short story, "Perchance to Dream," is very bright, ingenious, and pleasing, with just enough of dramatic compression and interaction to give relief and vivacity to the tale itself. One suspects that the author's study in French comedy was the most fortunate training a novelist of his cosmopolitan "machinery" could have, and perhaps tyros in the art might profitably take a hint from this. The attractive article of the number is Mr. Laurence Hutton's historical résumé of "The American Play," by which he means drama American in theme as well as in authorship. He displays the most detailed knowledge of his subject, as was to be expected, and though our dramatic literature turns out to be very ephemeral and insignificant, both intrinsically and by comparison, the story is made entertaining. The magazine's symposium, which it calls "Our Monthly Gossip," has received its share of the fresh life infused into the whole body, under the new management, and two of the participants, at least, write cleverly. One of them brings the discussion of "Our Literary Centre" to a *reductio ad absurdum*, perhaps unintentionally, by pointing out that if the test is the output of published matter, Washington is more than the rival of New York, and if it is original quality and excellence, then the Southwest, or, to choose a locality, Murfreesboro', Tenn., is the omphalos of our literary republic. Further than this the discussion can hardly go. We expect now that some one of these minor chatterers, who have a corner reserved for them in nearly all the magazines, will suggest the location of our "National Westminster Abbey" in the Yellowstone Park.

— The *Century* for March, besides its usual assortment of fiction, has one of Mr. Benjamin's interesting papers upon Persia, another chapter on our recent architecture, with examples, and a sketch of "Italy from a Tricycle," of which the character is sufficiently indicated by its title. Mr. Washington Gladden contributes the serious public article, and adds one more to his persistent efforts to invigorate our social life with a catholic Christian spirit. He discusses the "Strength and Weakness of Socialism," and criticises in particular Gronlund's recent work on the 'Coöperative Commonwealth.' The subject naturally falls into the two divisions of grievances and remedies, or the critical and constructive aspects of the movement now demanding wide attention for itself; and Mr. Gladden seems to accept the validity of the criticism while he rejects the proposed reconstruction. It is scarcely necessary to add that he is of that group who hold that a revival of the religious spirit on the side of philanthropy—or, as he might prefer to put it, the Christianization of our economical system—is the one thing needful; not the elimination of the motive of self-interest and the method of competition altogether, but their limitation by a humane public spirit and the coöperative system in the industrial groups. The paper is suggestive of the advance of opinion, and helps to state the social problem in clearer terms for popular apprehension. Every such article is a gain.

—General Buell's paper on the battle of Shiloh is one of the most important that have yet been published. Its chief interest, of course, lies in the fact that it is his response, as Commander of the Army of Ohio at the time, to General Grant's statements of the character of that engagement and the results of the first day's fighting. The subject has been one about which much bitter feeling and prejudice has gathered, and opposite opinions are almost fiercely held by the surviving officers and men of the two great army organizations of the Tennessee and the Cumberland. General Buell's paper, although certainly guarded in expression, is really a determined attack upon the military reputation of both Grant and Sherman as connected with that campaign. It is unfortunate that it conveys the impression that it is written from the enemy's point of view (in the military sense), and that, if its reasoning is correct, the Confederates had nothing to do in the late afternoon of April 6 but to capture the remnant of Grant's army almost without resistance. That this is an exaggerated view is sufficiently clear from the simple fact that such a capture was not made before Buell's divisions could cross the Tennessee. To thus put Grant's command quite *hors de combat* was logically necessary in order to show that what General Buell calls the second battle of Shiloh was the victorious work of the Army of Ohio alone, or substantially alone. A very significant counterpart to this article is found in the "Memoranda," where, from a respectable Confederate source, is clear confirmation of the fact that Beauregard's order withdrawing his troops was being executed at the Confederate left and centre before the final attack by their extreme right at dusk; thus showing that Grant was correct in saying that the "*furor* of the attack was exhausted" before that time. There was glory enough on the two days for both the national organizations and for the brave Confederates to boot, and the unprejudiced reader will not sympathize with an army *esprit de corps* which seeks victory over its comrades more than over the common foe. This paper has valuable additions to the views from photographs of the field and the river at Pittsburgh Landing, and excellent portraits of Generals Crittenden, Wood, McCook, and Terrill.

—The *Southern Bivouac* for March has a valuable contribution to the history of the "Kentucky Resolutions of 1798 and 1799." This consists in part of a facsimile of Thomas Jefferson's letter of December 11, 1821, to J. Cabell Breckenridge, in which he avows the authorship of the Resolutions. There is also a facsimile of a printed copy of the Resolutions as they passed the Legislature, of which the author of the article says it is "an original copy now in the possession of the writer." The reproduction of the letter, with the address, frank, and postmark, conclusively settles the disputed point as to the person to whom the letter was addressed. The face of the letter had no address upon it, and the executor of Mr. Jefferson, finding a copy among the deceased statesman's papers, was misled by its phraseology into supposing it was addressed to a son of Wilson C. Nicholas, of Kentucky, and so endorsed it. From this the error has passed into general history. An inspection of the facsimile shows how naturally this occurred in the absence of the proper address. Mr. Jefferson accidentally omitted a comma in his sentence mentioning the trio of gentlemen who consulted over the matter at Monticello. The letter reads: "your father Col. W. C. Nicholas and myself happening to be together," making apparently a conference of but two persons. The restoration of the outer address of the letter proves that "your father" and "Col. W. C. Nicholas" were different persons, the former being John Breckenridge. As to the second document (the facsimile of the printed copy of the Resolutions) the evidence is less conclusive. It is known that varying versions of the Resolutions got early into print with every apparent mark of authenticity. Attention was formerly called to this matter in the *Nation* (vol. 37, pp. 330, 392, 414). A facsimile of an old printed copy therefore proves nothing unless it be established when, where, and by what authority the printed copy was made. For the authenticity of the present one nothing is offered but the assertion of the author of the article; an omission which would indicate that he was not aware of the precise form the discussion has taken. The original archives of Kentucky of that date were lost in an accidental burning of the State House many years ago. The Governor of the State had been authorized to send copies of the Resolutions to the other States, and some of these official transcripts should be in existence. Till they are found, it would seem premature to assume that the official text is restored—certainly not without full evidence of superior authenticity of the copy produced. The effect of any al-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

leged modifications by Mr. Breckenridge in Jefferson's original draft would be a question still further on.

—Henry Stevens, who died at his house in London on the last day of winter, had lived there forty years, but was by birth a Vermonter. His father, a farmer far up the Connecticut, when the boy had learned "small Latin and less Greek" from the village minister, gave him a colt and told him he must work his passage through college. The youngster rode to Middlebury, entered the freshman class in 1838, sold his horse to pay for books and board, and eked out his income by teaching penmanship. After a year or two, obtaining a committee clerkship in Washington, he became acquainted with Peter Force. Thanks to a few old Revolutionary papers sent to the young clerk by his father, he obtained from Mr. Force and others funds enough for his support while completing his collegiate course at Yale. Being a bibliomaniac, both by heredity and habit, he was eager to see a library worthy of the name. Obtaining a loan of eight hundred dollars, half from Mr. Force and half from Francis Parkman, he crossed the ocean in 1846. Before he had rambled very long in the British Museum he detected some of its weak points. In an interview with one of its managers he pointed out its lack of certain American books it could not afford to dispense with. In this exposure he showed such intelligence that he received a commission to supply the deficiency. Faithful in little, he was gradually commissioned to do much. In 1884 he told an American visitor that he had furnished the Museum library with a hundred thousand books or pamphlets. He showed him one thin volume for which he was paid two hundred and fifty pounds. He had supplied the greatest of British libraries with the larger part of its American books. In turning over its catalogue for an illustration, he opened to the name of Joshua Bates, once President of Middlebury College, and read the titles of twenty-eight of his publications garnered up there by Mr. Stevens. One of his early enterprises was buying up the books of Washington from the proprietor of Mount Vernon, and forcing the solid men of Boston to pay well for those of them that were retained in America. Another of his exploits was gleaning and gathering so many papers of Dr. Franklin that Congress paid thirty thousand dollars to secure them. Mr. Stevens was followed abroad by brothers, and trained up a son to take his place as a literary and preeminently an historical intermediary between the New World and the Old. His book-store lately showed more than fifteen thousand curious and rare pamphlets relating to America, each bound up as a separate volume, and his last labors were in preparing a catalogue of this unique collection. On the whole, while cosmopolitan in his relations, he always turned fondly to his mother State. He named his house Vermont Cottage. G. M. B., meaning 'Green Mountain Boy,' was the only title he would affix to his name. When a freshman at Middlebury he had advertised his wish to be a writing-master by writing his proposals, in a superb hand, on a sheet of paper which he stuck up on the bulletin-board. That sheet he carried to London and hung it in a frame in a conspicuous place on the wall of his store. No doubt it hangs there still.

—A writer in St. Petersburg, reviewing a translation into Turkish of Griboyedoff's famous comedy, "Woe from Wit," gives some curious details about the stage on the shores of the Bosphorus. Within ten years not a few plays have been written in verse by Turkish authors. Thanks to them, the close-drawn curtains of the harem become more than transparent. They show the women not jealously veiled, but in their ordinary home dress, in the midst of an exact reproduction of the furniture and decorations of the harem. Even their soft, musical speech, almost a dialect of itself, is reproduced. The subjects are chosen sometimes to present the comedy of manners, and sometimes the tragedies of which that life is full. The writer further notes the change that has been rather rapidly going on in the last few years, from a kind of blind aping of western manners in certain respects to an intelligent study and understanding of western civilization, especially of its literature. An interesting list is given of books translated into Turkish since the beginning of the reign of Abdul-Aziz. The most important are Chateaubriand's 'Atala'; Victor Hugo's 'Les Misérables,' "Ernani"; Dumas's, "La Dame aux Camélias," and his father's 'Monte Christo'; Sue's 'Les Mystères de Paris,' Octave Feuillet's 'Le Roman d'un jeune homme pauvre,' Lamartine's 'Graziella,' X. de Maistre's 'Les Prisonniers du Caucase,' Volney's 'Ruines,' Silvio Pellico's 'Le mie Prigioni.' 'Robinson Crusoe'; "The Winter's Tale," "Othello," "The Merchant of Venice"; Molière's "Le Bourgeois gentilhomme," "Le Mariage forcé," "Le Médecin malgré lui," "Tartufe"; Émile de Girardin's "Cléopâtre," selections from Voltaire, La Fontaine, and Fénelon—of 'Télémaque' there are two translations. It may be added that all these books are regularly for sale by the leading bookseller of Constantinople, who, by the way, is an Armenian.

TWO RECENT BOOKS UPON CALIFORNIA HISTORY.

History of California. By Theodore H. Hittell. Volume i. San Francisco: Pacific Press Publishing House. 1885.

History of the Pacific States of North America. By Hubert Howe Bancroft. Vols. xiv and xv. California, vols. ii (1801-24) and iii (1825-40). San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft & Co.

THE Territorial history of California was until very recently an obscure and, in many parts, a quite unknown field. Lawyers, toiling over the great land cases, had indeed produced and printed a few very valuable historical briefs, such as Dwinelle's 'Colonial History of San Francisco.' The life of Junípero Serra, by his friend Palou, together with a few travellers' books, had also been made the basis of many tales about the early mission life. But nearly all the rest of the history of the Territory of California, before the conquest in 1846, had remained a mystery, concerning which we were ready to believe almost any story that an apparently well-informed person might repeat. Of a sudden, however, this blank ignorance has passed away, and all things are become new. Mr. Hubert Howe Bancroft's elaborate history has reached, with the volumes before us, the year 1840, and now comes Mr. Theodore Hittell with the first of his two volumes, wherein he reaches the end of the Spanish rule in California, and begins the history of the Territory under Mexican government. The second and closing volume of Mr. Hittell's work is to bring his history to the admission of the State of California in 1850, while the fourth and fifth volumes of Mr. Bancroft's history are expected to cover the years from 1840 to 1846, the conquest by the Americans in 1846-47, and the remaining Territorial history as far as to the gold discovery in 1848. Thus, in a very short time, we may expect to have two elaborate and independent accounts of the whole life of California before 1849.

Two questions occur at once to the general reader's mind when he sees these bulky volumes, whose contents are so very largely made up from previously inaccessible manuscript sources, and whose methods of treatment are, in both cases, so space-consuming, and, in form at least, so thoroughgoing. Why, one first asks, has our previous knowledge of Territorial California been so meagre, so inaccurate, often so legendary? For these books contain on nearly every page information never before in print, and very frequently correct errors of many years' standing and of wide prevalence in previous literature. And why, on the other hand, one again asks, has it been found necessary, now that the truth has at last been studied, for both Mr. Bancroft and Mr. Hittell to state it at such length? The paradox of this sudden transformation, whereby one of the most ill-treated of our Territorial histories becomes of a sudden one of the most elaborately and minutely investigated of all, deserves explanation. The answer to both our questions lies no doubt partly in the singular love of the modern Californian for colossal undertakings. Either the Californian must utterly neglect and despise the colonial history of his province, or else he must endeavor, so to speak, to provide means for a careful cataloguing of every bullock whose hide was ever exported from Mexican California: such seems the inevitable expression in this direction of the fine energy and the somewhat extensive ambitions of a community whose youth was passed in dreams of gold, and whose later years have been devoted to vast industrial and commercial undertakings. The wealthy Californian of mark and intelligence undertakes some such task as founding his own private university, producing his own private school of literature, or leaving as his monument the greatest observatory on earth, just as the wealthy Californian of mark but not of intelligence is contented with building a bigger house than his fellow-millionaire, or with owning more acres of land than his rival. Such sorts of magnificence extend themselves very readily to the methods of scholarly work. Mr. Bancroft is a wealthy Californian of a certainly uncommon intelligence and power for work, and Mr. Hittell's ability and energy are also undoubted. Mr. Bancroft's book is on a far larger scale than Mr. Hittell's, but both books agree in a scrutiny of the early history of California such as shows an ardent desire to produce not only serviceable, but also monumental books.

But in another way, also, our questions may receive a partial answer. This minute scrutiny of the old California life expresses not only the private ambitions of authors, but the late and now fruitless repentance of the American as he remembers the little world of life that his cruel progress in California has destroyed. If there was any purpose strong in our American mind in the early golden days of California, it was to neglect, to despise, or to ignore everything peculiar to the natives of the land that we had so rudely seized. For years we set our faces against the customs and the rights of the former inhabitants. Only the strong necessities of land litigation could force us to begin the study of the older history; but this study, vivified after a good many years by the warmth of poetic sentiment, has now, under the influence of the personal ambitions aforesaid, suddenly assumed the imposing proportions of these works. We who came to contemn have remained to study most lovingly and devoutly.

As to the relative merits of these two books as they stand, a considerable examination has convinced us that not only in bulk, but also in scholarly completeness and in accuracy of detail, the work of Mr. Bancroft and his collaborators is greatly superior to Mr. Hittell's work. In readableness, however, Mr. Hittell's book stands on the whole a little higher. In fairness toward the people described, in good sense, in sound judgment of the meaning of facts once fully ascertained, both books seem, so far as we can now decide, nearly equal—a fact which cannot fail to be of great value to any future student of the subject. As the case stands, then, one cannot be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sure of the details of Mr. Hittell's story, in any of its more complex or obscure portions, without comparing it with Mr. Bancroft's account. But it is easier to read Mr. Hittell's book, chapter after chapter; and his opinion about the significance of the once correctly narrated story is always worthy of consideration. Were Mr. Hittell's book alone, one would think of it very highly indeed. So long as it is not alone, but has for its rival an undertaking that began to appear in the field some years earlier, and that is founded upon a far richer collection of original material, we can only regret that Mr. Hittell did not either publish his work five or ten years ago, or else postpone publication until he could appear as Mr. Bancroft's best equipped and ablest critic. For the moment, however, Mr. Hittell says nothing of the existence of the larger work, and the two undertakings lack all evidence of that friendly and critical coöperation and rivalry with each other wherein lies the very life of progressive scholarship. Mr. Bancroft's volumes have had, to be sure, no opportunity to mention or to criticise Mr. Hittell's book, which appears later than they.

Our opinion as to the comparative accuracy of the two books is indeed, we must confess, necessarily dependent almost wholly upon a comparative study of their own pages, since, save the authors, no man has had the opportunity to deal elaborately with the manuscript sources upon which nearly all this early California history rests. But where the work done is so elaborate, a comparison is sufficiently fruitful of results to make such a judgment as we have formed at least a possible one. Both writers mention their chief sources, and in Mr. Bancroft's book these sources are in all doubtful cases elaborately cited and compared, so that the reader is able to form in some measure his own opinion. Mr. Bancroft's work also cites numberless and, for us, of course, quite inaccessible minor authorities, whose actual presence in mind, as determining factors in the attainment of the results set forth, is at least presumable. Mr. Hittell's citations are briefer, and his principle of selection among the authorities that he has used is seldom if ever confessed. But, in any case, a fair comparison of the work done in the two books is, on the basis of these quotations and citations, not out of the question. One sees, in the first place, the advantage given to Mr. Bancroft by the far greater wealth of his material. Wherever, for instance, the Russian colony at Ross is under discussion, Mr. Bancroft's collaborators have at hand original Russian documents of great importance for the purpose, while Mr. Hittell is confined to the printed accounts and to the Spanish archives. Mr. Bancroft's Mission documents, again, are vastly more numerous, and his collections of private letters, written by Californians of all periods from the beginning down, are very helpful to him. Mr. Hittell uses, among manuscript sources, for the most part only the public archives, and has the advantage of only a very few private manuscripts. In this respect, then, he is at some distance behind his bulky competitor.

But the result of this, for the accuracy of the work done, is considerable. If the history of an outlying and impecunious Mexican province, such as California was before 1846, is to be told at all, especially in such large volumes, it might as well be accurately told. And where Mr. Bancroft gives elaborate citations to prove what he relates in great detail, while Mr. Hittell, passing over the same point more hastily, and citing either no authorities at all or less important authorities, makes statements in direct or indirect opposition to the results of the rival work, the general reader must have, at least provisionally, more confidence in the historian whose witnesses are the more numerous and the more carefully cross-questioned. Examples of such conflicts are not hard to find. Where dates are concerned, the formality of Mr. Bancroft's story, with its strictly chronological statement of the general history of the Territory for each successive year, generally assures us of his greater care in this respect. Thus, on page 501 of his volume, Mr. Hittell says that Señan "seems to have held" the two offices of president and prefect of the missions from 1823 to 1825; while Mr. Bancroft, using mission archives that Mr. Hittell does not cite, knows (vol. ii, p. 489, *seqq.*) that Señan died in August, 1823, and that thenceforth, until April, 1825, Sarría was mission president. The offices in question were of course important, if anything in California in those days can be called important. There are a number of instances of this sort in Mr. Hittell's record of the mission life, so that one could not venture to found any conclusions on his dates of minor events.

More important, however, are the differences between the two historians as to the policy of the Californian authorities in certain cases. Mr. Hittell knows (p. 494 and p. 642) that the San Rafael Mission was founded in 1817 as "a kind of bulwark or barrier" against the Russians in the north. This opinion he seems to found on one or two authorities only; but Mr. Bancroft's book, in a discussion founded on an elaborate study of the whole correspondence of the time, concludes (vol. ii, pp. 316 and 329) that "there is nothing to indicate such a purpose," and shows us that commercial intercourse between San Rafael and the Ross Colony was from the first "almost continuous." In case of the earlier affair of Rezánoff's visit to San Francisco in 1806, the relations of that officer both to the Californian authorities and to the fair Concepcion Argüello, whose romantic tale Mr. Bret Harte has made so famous, appear in Mr. Bancroft's account for the first time in their true light, since Rezánoff's official reports to his Government contain facts about the policy and conduct of the officials which the Spanish authorities could not well record in their archives, and some facts about his own intentions that even Doña Concepcion herself never learned. Rezánoff, namely, although he tried to conceal the fact, had come to buy supplies for the starving Russian colony at Sitka. The Californian officials had no legal right to trade with him, and for a time refused. Thereupon Rezánoff, to carry his point, made love to the commandante's daughter at San Francisco, and, when he had won her heart, her good father permitted their betrothal. Thenceforth Rezánoff, as he says, "managed this port of his Catholic Majesty" in the interest of his own undertaking. Soon the supplies were obtained, by an illegal compromise with the officials, and thereafter Rezánoff spread his sails, and, having promised an early return to his beloved, disappeared through the Gate into the sea. His death soon after concealed his to-day obvious infidelity, and left Doña Concepcion a faithful mourner for the rest of her life. All this affair Mr. Hittell has read of only in the old and much-distorted printed narratives. His entire account of it is therefore untrustworthy. The incident itself is important, as being the first in the history of the Russian activity in California. Utterly ungrounded appears to be Mr. Hittell's assertion (p. 626) that the Russian Government ever gained permission from the Spanish Court to found an establishment on the Californian coast for the purpose of fur hunting. The settlement at Ross was made without any sort of Spanish permission (Bancroft, vol. ii, p. 82, p. 299, note, and p. 304, note). Mr. Hittell's assertion is apparently founded only on Kotzebue's, while Mr. Bancroft's is, as usual, the outcome of the study of many cited authorities.

Especially subject to error Mr. Hittell seems further to be wherever he follows the manuscript of very imperfect reminiscences which Alvarado, sometime Mexican Governor of California, prepared in his old age, and of which Mr. Bancroft also possesses and frequently cites a copy. Upon this manuscript is founded Mr. Hittell's account of the transition of California from Spanish rule to the Mexican Imperial Regency of Iturbide in 1822; and here, in consequence, his story of the change is as dramatic as it is unreal and even absurd. The locally important events of months, painfully detailed in Mr. Bancroft's account of this period, are by Mr. Hittell treated as non-existent, and the events of entirely different years are crowded into one scene. The result is an extreme of misstatement that can only be appreciated by comparing the accounts of the two historians at this point; and Mr. Bancroft's relative accuracy is plain from the fact that he could not well have invented the months full of events which he here carefully details, and which Mr. Hittell's account, were it true, would render impossible. Mr. Hittell here makes, in fact, statements as far from the historical truth as would be the assertion that our Declaration of Independence was signed on the day of the battle of Lexington.

While, therefore, Mr. Hittell's accuracy, never perfect, is at some points intolerably wanting, his general knowledge, so far as, with his relatively imperfect sources and with his rather summary method, he could be expected to attain it, is for the greater part of this volume indubitable; and so, properly checked by reference to Mr. Bancroft, his book will be of no small use to students of his topic. His style is simple, unadorned, and not unpleasant; and his reflections are always worthy of respectful notice.

Of volumes ii and iii of Mr. Bancroft's 'California,' considered in themselves, one must surely say that their method is obviously conscientious, and has aimed to secure exhaustive accuracy. Whether the end has been fully attained, we can in no wise judge. For if Mr. Bancroft frequently gives us positive data whereby we may with fair assurance correct Mr. Hittell, the latter, so far, has given us no such help with respect to his rival, and a perfectly intelligent and thorough-going criticism of Mr. Bancroft's results would require long researches among the documents that fill his own immense library. What we can say here must be confined to a more external criticism of his book. That these volumes are unreadable is already a common assertion of popular criticism; and they are surely not exactly a great work of historic art as art. But we find in them many admirable literary qualities. To whom in particular these are due is indeed not revealed, since Mr. Bancroft confessedly and willingly shares with his devoted anonymous collaborators the honors of his colossal literary undertaking. At all events, however, we do find in these volumes one quality that some critics have missed in other volumes of the "Pacific Coast History," namely, a certain unity, both of workmanship and of judgment, which we must highly admire in view of the number of hands that are supposed to have been at work in preparing the manuscript. Mr. Bancroft and his collaborators have here somehow joined themselves in an exceptionally close personal union, so that they for this time actually work as one man, whose character and general literary style are equally admirable: an unrhetorical, thoroughly sensible man, with an unwearied diligence, a suppressed but plainly intense scholarly enthusiasm, a quiet humor, and an excellent facility for summarizing, in few words, characters and situations. As Mr. Bancroft's use of many subordinates is too often supposed to give to all the labor done in his library a composite and disunited character, which his own work in rewriting the manuscript is gene-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rally insufficient to remove, we take pleasure in pointing out the well-defined personal unity manifest throughout the 'California,' and in congratulating Mr. Bancroft, as the presumed master workman, that here at least is a book which reads like the almost undisturbed product of a single devoted and enthusiastic mind. May his revision and final alteration of the work of his collaborators always affect their industry in just the same fashion as here, and with just as happy results.

What we do object to in this book, therefore, is not the style, which is simple, manly, and earnest, nor the immensity of detail, which is the result of the original plan, but rather that defect of method which has forced the worker to distinguish so sharply secular annals from mission annals, both of these from commercial annals and from foreign affairs, and all these together from the local annals of each district. It is this sharp division which gives the best foundation to the charge that this book is unreadable. Personal unity, as we have said, is present throughout these two volumes—unity of purpose, of judgment, of enthusiasm, and of knowledge. But an artistic unity of the many currents of the narrative into one great stream has not been quite reached. If the same hand that has given the personal unity to the work could only once more rewrite it, the higher unity of historical workmanship could now perhaps be attained. But it is not given us to live our lives twice.

The third volume of the 'California' is full of the complex political struggles of the republican era, and closes, with 1840, in the midst of the Alvarado administration. We await with great curiosity and interest the fourth and fifth volumes, which will embrace, as we have said, the exciting story of the American conquest. Meanwhile we wish for this whole California history, the most carefully prepared of all Mr. Bancroft's great series, the fullest attention and best criticism of all historical students interested in the topic. For here, whatever else may be said about the matter, is a very remarkable and permanently valuable book.

An Apache Campaign in the Sierra Madre: An account of the expedition in pursuit of the hostile Chiricahua Apaches in the spring of 1883. By John G. Bourke, Captain Third Cavalry, U. S. Army, author of 'The Snake Dance of the Moquis.' Illustrated. Charles Scribner's Sons. 1886. 112 pp.

THIS little volume is handsomely bound, the print is good and large, but the illustrations are insignificant. Whoever has read Captain Bourke's excellent book on the Snake Dance must regret that he has not done better by his present highly interesting subject—General Crook's Sonora expedition, of which he was the acting Adjutant-General. His failure, however, is mostly ascribable to the fact that the text is composed of magazine articles, which originally appeared in *Outing*.

Captain Bourke always writes well and pleasantly for the general and superficial reader, but in this instance the public had a right to ask for positive geographical information, for an historical introduction explaining the real causes of the Chiricahua troubles, and, above all, for much greater impartiality. Our author says truly: "Within the compass of this volume it is impossible to furnish a complete dissertation upon the Apache Indians or the causes which led up to the expedition about to be described." But there was absolutely no need for a volume of such limited compass, and as to the geographical data, we insist on them, first, because nobody in the present century has described the regions traversed, and because *geography is, according to Count Moltke, one*-half of military science, and to pretend explaining Indian warfare without resorting to it is futile. Capt. Bourke has many clever descriptions of local scenery, and scattered allusions to vegetation and rock-formations, but what we miss is a clear and comprehensive topographical statement. A single page would have sufficed for that purpose, but the book has not even names of mountain chains in it; that of "Sierra Madre" excepted.

The Chiricahuas are not at all to be confounded with the rest of the Apaches, and Captain Bourke ought to have dispelled a common error which imputes to the whole tribe the acts of only a small fraction of desperadoes, with whom that tribe disclaims, and disclaimed in 1883, any communion. The history of the Chiricahuas can be gathered from *printed* sources; it goes as far back as 1684, but might have been summed up in half a page. Captain Bourke does well to shield the Apaches from numberless distorted and slanderous statements. His excellent description of their physical appearance and of their character stands in happy contrast with Mr. H. H. Bancroft's incorrect appreciation. It is, however, in bad taste for an officer of the United States army to lean so strongly to the Apache side at the expense of the Mexican people and army. Mexicans, more particularly in the mountain districts of Sonora and Chihuahua, were always at a great disadvantage. Fire-arms, until lately, were scarce and of very old patterns. The Apache was far better provided. Regular troops hardly came into play, being needed to head off "revolutions" and unable to protect the Sierra Madre; and yet the Mexicans have not done so very badly after all. Of course, the affair at Tres Castillos, when Victorio, after outgeneralling and whipping everybody in New Mexico, was *wiped out by the Chihuahua militia, does not* count. But the Alisos fight on the 30th of April, 1882, is sadly misrepresented by Captain Bourke, following Apache statements. It is true that a great majority of Indians killed were women and children, but as to the Chiricahuas' claim "that when the main body of their warriors reached the scene of the engagement, the Mexicans evinced no anxiety to come out from the rifle pits they hastily dug," just the opposite occurred. A number of Apaches hid in a sinkhole and were exterminated there at the point of the bayonet. Mexicans have been surprised time and again; so have our troops, even during the last campaign. As to killing the Mexicans with rocks only, Captain Bourke should have known that it was an Indian boast in allusion to an affair at Taraysitos in the Sierra Madre. There they did indeed hurl rocks upon the troops and wounded some; but when the "cowardly" Mexicans scaled the almost vertical cliffs, the "brave" Apaches vanished.

The book contains a number of covert slurs and flings at the army and people of our neighbor republic. As far as the army is concerned they are mostly concealed behind Apache utterances; still, their tendency is to bias and prejudice the reader's mind. In regard to the people he is more outspoken, so much so that even buildings do not escape his wrath. He speaks of churches as "in the last stages of dilapidation," and includes the temple at Babispe, a noble structure, built after the plan of San Javier del Bac, only much larger, of masonry and not with an "adobe exterior." Careless statements abound. The "Estancia" is called a "hamlet" like Huachinera, whereas it is only a *hacienda* belonging to Don Antonio Samaniego. No clue is given to the locality where General Crook met the Apache camp, no names of mountain chains surrounding it. For the benefit of the acting adjutant-general we will state that it is called Los Metates, and lies between the Sierra de Huachinera and the Sierra de los Parapetos, almost north of Nacori. The cañon which they moved up "in an easterly direction" is called Cajon de Bamochi, and the Apaches had camped in its upper parts for some time previous, as every child at Huachinera well knew. The Opata-Indian name for the range at whose feet the *rancheria* was surprised, is Quéva-ué-richi. Of the Opatas, who still form the bulk of population along the upper Yaqui (called Babispe) River, not a word is said, yet they are a most interesting people.

Like carelessness is evinced even in matters pertaining to the so-called "campaign" proper. In the first place, it was no "campaign"—rather an armed peace mission, and General Crook was actuated by motives which forever commend him to sincere admiration. He would have carried it out exclusively on that plan had it not been for the cowardly rashness of his own scouts. At Los Metates they fired prematurely, against the positive orders of Captain Emmet Crawford, and it is very doubtful if more than two of the renegades were killed (Captain Bourke says nine). The fourteen or fifteen Apaches who were in the rancheria afterwards defied all of the scouts boldly and openly from the tops of the cliffs, but the others did not dare to attack; they were and always have been mortally afraid of the Chiricahuas. These scouts were the weak element in General Crook's force; they came very near upsetting all his plans and bringing him and his troops to the verge of utter ruin. It was in the negotiations which followed, and in the fact that General Crook remained quietly where he was without pursuing or retreating, that he showed his genius and ability. Thus he secured the women and children, and saved himself from a surprise at daybreak that Gerónimo had planned. There is much more romance about this Sonora dash *than Captain Bourke has intimated, and its com*mander has claims upon more respect, admiration, and gratitude than this book would entitle him to. The subject is worthy of careful treatment, such as the 'Moqui Snake Dance' has shown Captain Bourke capable of undertaking and accomplishing.

Lord Beaconsfield's Correspondence with his Sister. 1832-1852. Harper & Bros. 1886.

THESE letters are the merest notes, dashed off wherever the writer happened to be, only to give the news of the moment, literary, social, or political. They cover the opening of his London career both as an author and a politician, and afford a singularly effective proof of the completeness of Disraeli's absorption in his worldly success. It is not that he speaks of himself, for that was the subject his sister wished to hear of; but the tone of the whole is that of the worldling. Besides this, there are only a few *mots* and characterizations to interest posterity. Most interesting is his account of his "failure" in his first speech, which seems to have been by no means what it has been represented. He says he gets on "easily in the highest set, where there is no envy, malice, etc., and where they like to admire and be amused," while he is "hated by the second-rate men"; and in his first Parliamentary years we find him ascribing his popularity "to the smoking-room." He evidently cultivated the art of being agreeable in the right quarters with forethought and effort, and always had his eye on the effect. There are maxims of Rochefoucauld prudence and fulness of meaning here. He was frank in describing men. Washington Irving he thought "vulgar and stupid"; Webster, he believes, "considered a very refined and *spirituel* Yankee, but seemed to me a complete Brother Jonathan—a remarkable twang"; "chattering Milnes" (Lord Houghton) kept him at a dull dinner from "the consolation of a silent stuff";

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gladstone (in 1845) "may have an *avenir*, but I hardly think it"; "a Guizot or a Thiers, a professor and a *rédacteur*"; and again, "that rascal Thiers, a thorough representative of the *gaminerie* of Paris"; and so on. Very characteristic is this on the French aristocracy: "What names, but where are their territories? There are only one hundred men in France who have 10,000*l.* per annum. Henry Hope and De Rothschild could buy them all!" His family attachment seems the only part of his nature not touched with the calculating spirit.

Three Americans and Three Englishmen: Lectures read before the students of Trinity College, Hartford. By Charles F. Johnson, A.M. Thomas Whittaker. 1886.

PROF. JOHNSON'S book is a characteristic product of American literary culture. It exhibits wide and intelligent reading, a frank indebtedness to others, a modest deference to established critical authority, a tendency to philosophy, an admirable working style, shrewdness, incisiveness, and definiteness of thought; and within its department is altogether creditable. We say this with no idea that any one will expect to find in these college lectures on Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Shelley, Hawthorne, Emerson, and Longfellow, anything startlingly novel in the way of criticism, and in spite of the fact that more than one paragraph is merely traditional, narrow, not to be justified—as, for example, the denial of the sense of moral responsibility to Shelley against which so slight a fragment as his four lines on "Consequence" is final evidence. But the general tone and level of the work are signs of a mind cultivated in the best sense. One very striking feature of the whole, for it would be superfluous to speak of such essays individually, is the lament over the present decadence, as it seems, of literature into something which may be art but surely is not wisdom, and the incessant praise of the idealistic temper and imaginative sight which made the dying age as memorable as the Elizabethan, saving only Shakspere's name. It is something that the youth who hear such teaching as this may thank heaven for, to have one over them who is so sure of the exceeding worth of the spiritual interpretation of life, and can read it to them from such masters of it as five at least of these six men were. Prof. Johnson's words go home with an edge, too, and are not lost in any mere cloud of ethereal eulogy; they are of the kind that educate, both by their enlightening power when used for praise, and their discriminating power when employed for censure—just such work, we should say, as college boys need, but perhaps too closely adapted to that audience to have their full effect in the world.

History of Ireland for Schools. By William F. Collier, LL. D. Marcus Ward & Co.

APART from intrinsic merit, this work deserves notice as the first 'History of Ireland,' so far as we know, recognized by any British governmental department for study in Irish schools. It has lately been placed upon the list of books for the use of children who are annually examined before the Intermediate Education Board. Even to this day no Irish history is taught in the national schools and very little in private (especially Protestant) academies. We heard an Irish-boarding-school lad remark, on first seeing a copy of this book, "I didn't know there was any history of Ireland." We have here clear type and arrangement and plenty of wood-cut sketches of things and places, antiquities, dress, weapons, portraits, besides a colored map of Ireland. There could scarcely be a better companion to a traveller's hand-book. Upon the whole it is more suited for advanced than junior pupils. There is much in it that will perhaps be new even to many who consider they have a fair knowledge of the subject, or that will revive their recollections. Written for common use in a country where there is as yet no common national life, it is necessarily guarded and unemotional. There is every effort to be fair. That test period of the real opinions of an Irish historian—1641—is moderately treated. But upon the whole the Nationalists have more reason to complain than their opponents. The inspiring spirit of Swift's later writings regarding Ireland—protest against the subjection to England—is hardly even referred to, and more justice might be done to the aims and intentions of the United Irishmen and Young Irelanders.

This book must appear to children dry and depressing compared with the histories of successful countries. Irish history is made interesting and inspiring only when vivified by the lives and characters and intentions of the constant succession of men who, on behalf of Ireland, have exhibited devoted and unflinching self-sacrifice. That would be difficult in such a work as the present. The introduction in the early part of the book of the original names of persons and places in the Irish character is not suited to the readers for whom the book is primarily intended, although perhaps it may pique curiosity regarding the ancient language. The use of this history in Irish schools will doubtless have the effect of increasing the interest of numbers of the youth of Ireland in their own country, and of arousing a spirit of inquiry which can be satisfied only by reference to other sources of information, probably of a less passionless and more suggestive and inspiring character.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Barr, Mrs. Amelia E. The Last of the Macallisters: A Novel. Harper's Handy Series. 25 cents.
Blackie, J. S. What Does History Teach? Harper's Handy Series. 25 cents.
Childs, E. E. A History of the United States in Chronological Order from the Discovery of America in 1492 to 1885. Baker & Taylor. $1.
Clarke, Rev. J. F. Every-Day Religion. Boston: Ticknor & Co. $1.50.
Compayré, G. The History of Pedagogy. Translated, with introduction, notes, and index, by W. H. Payne. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. $1.75.
Deering, F. P. The Codes and Statutes of California, as Amended and in Force at the Close of the 26th Session of the Legislature, 1885. Vol. 4. Penal Code. San Francisco: A. L. Bancroft & Co. $7.50.
De Graff, E. V. The School-room Chorus: A Collection of 200 Songs for Public and Private Schools. 70th ed. Syracuse: C. W. Bardeen. 35 cents.
Devas, C. S. Studies in Family Life: A Contribution to Social Science. Burns & Oates.
Diehl, C. Ravenne. Paris: J. Rouam.
Directory of the Charitable and Beneficent Organizations in Boston. Cupples, Upham & Co.
Directory of the Music Trade and the Musical Profession in the United States. 1885-1886. H. A. Rost.
Énault, L. Carine. W. R. Jenkins. 25 cents.
Farjeon, B. L. Aunt Parker: A Novel. Harper's Franklin Square Library. 20 cents.
Fradenburgh, Dr. J. N. Witnesses from the Dust; or, The Bible Illustrated from the Monuments. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. $1.60.
Frank's Ranche; or, My Holiday in the Rockies. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.25.
Garrisson, G. Le Suicide dans l'Antiquité et dans les Temps Modernes. Paris: Arthur Rousseau.
Goodale, Prof. G. Physiological Botany. I. Outlines of the Histology of Phœnogamous Plants. II. Vegetable Physiology. Ivison, Blakeman, Taylor & Co.
Graham, E. T. Holly and Mistletoe: Songs Across the Snow. Illustrated. Baltimore: D. W. Glass & Co.
Greely, Lieut. A. W. Three Years of Arctic Service. 2 vols. Charles Scribner's Sons.
Green, Anna Katharine. Hand and Ring. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 20 cents.
Harte, Bret. Snow-Bound at Eagle's. Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.
Howells, W. D. Indian Summer. Boston: Ticknor & Co. $1.50.
Johnson, Prof. E. E. Life After Death, and Other Sermons. 2d ed. Hartford: Brown & Gross.
Lamb, Charles. Mrs. Leicester's School, and Other Writings in Prose and Verse. With Introduction by Alfred Ainger. A. C. Armstrong & Son. $1.50.
Macdonald, G. What's Mine's Mine: A Novel. Harper's Franklin Square Library. 20 cents.
Mair, C. Tecumseh: A Drama. Toronto: Hunter, Rose & Co.
McConkey, Rebecca. The Hero of Cowpens. Revised ed. Funk & Wagnalls. $1.70.
Mind in Nature: A Popular Journal of Psychical, Medical, and Scientific Information. Vol. I. Chicago: Cosmic Publishing Co. $1.25.
Molinari, G. de. Au Canada. F. W. Christern.
Morgan's Horror. Cassell & Co. 25 cents.
Morley, J. Rousseau. Macmillan & Co. 2 vols. $3.
Myers, P. V. N. Outlines of Mediæval History. Boston: Ginn & Co. $1.60.
Orvis-Cheney. Fishing with the Fly: Sketches by Lovers of the Art. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $2.50.
Palmer, Dr. A. B. The Temperance Teachings of Science. Adapted for the Public Schools. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co.
Patronage is Power. Montreal: Dawson Bros.
Perry, E. D. A Sanscrit Primer. Boston: Ginn & Co. $1.60
Raymond, Prof. G. L. Poetry as a Representative Art. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $1.75.
Reid, T. W. Mauleverer's Millions: A Yorkshire Romance. Harper's Handy Series. 25 cents.
Religious Progress: The Practical Christianity of Christ. London: Trübner & Co.
Rideing, W. H. Thackeray's London. Boston: Cupples, Upham & Co. $1.50.
Riley, J. W. The Boss Girl, and Other Sketches. Indianapolis: Bowen-Merrill Co. $1.

Henry Holt & Co.,

29 West 23d Street, New York,

HAVE RECENTLY PUBLISHED:

MAINE'S POPULAR GOVERNMENT. $2.75.
ZELLER'S OUTLINES OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY. $1.75.
FIELD'S FATHER'S TRAGEDY, etc. $1.75.
WALFORD'S HISTORY OF A WEEK. Pa., 25c.; cl., $1.
COVENTRY'S AFTER HIS KIND. $1.
MC'CLELLAND'S OBLIVION. $1.
CONWAY'S A CARDINAL SIN. Paper, 30c.; cloth, $1.

Hams and Breakfast Bacon.

45TH YEAR OF THE

"S. DAVIS, JR.,"

DIAMOND BRAND,

CINCINNATI.

Sold by Provision Dealers and Grocers, who have Circulars "How to Cook the Diamond Ham."

HIGH CLASS ETCHINGS.

A new illustrated Catalogue free by mail. Frederick Keppel & Co., 23 East 16th St., New York.

Unmounted Photographs

OF ANCIENT AND MODERN WORKS OF ART,

Embracing reproductions of famous original paintings, sculpture, architecture, etc. Price, cabinet size, $1.50 per dozen. Send 10-cent stamp for catalogue and supplement of over 7,000 subjects.

SOULE PHOTOGRAPH CO.,

Publishers, 338 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.
Please mention the *Nation*.

A MANUAL OF SKIN DISEASES.—Their description, diagnosis, and treatment. By Balmanno Squire, M.B., Surgeon to the British Hospital for diseases of the Skin, London, England. Pp. 194. F cap, 8vo, cloth, $1. A. N. MARQUIS & Co., Clark and Adams Streets, Chicago, Ill.

The Only Complete Guide to Mexico.

Appleton's

GUIDE TO MEXICO.

Including a Chapter on Guatemala and an English-Spanish Vocabulary.

By ALFRED R. CONKLING.

Third edition, thoroughly revised to present date. Just ready.

With railway map and illustrations. 12mo, cloth, price $2.

D. APPLETON & CO.,

PUBLISHERS,

1, 3, and 5 Bond Street, New York.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Macmillan & Co.'s

NEW BOOKS.

BY MR. FREDERIC HARRISON.

THE CHOICE OF BOOKS, AND other literary pieces. By Frederic Harrison. Globe 8vo, paper, 50 cents. *Now ready.*

CONTENTS:

"The Choice of Books," "Culture," "Past and Present," "The Romance of the Peerage," Froude's "Life of Carlyle," "The Life of George Eliot," "Bernard of Clairvaux," "A Few Words About the Eighteenth Century," "Histories of the French Revolution," "A Few Words About the Nineteenth Century," etc., etc.

A NEW NOVEL BY MR. HENRY JAMES.

THE BOSTONIANS. A NOVEL By Henry James, Author of "The Portrait of a Lady," "The American," "The Europeans," etc., etc. One volume, 12mo, $2.00. Next week.

A NEW NOVEL BY MR. F. MARION CRAWFORD.

A TALE OF A LONELY PARISH. By F. Marion Crawford, author of "Mr. Isaacs," "Dr. Claudius," etc., etc. 12mo, $1.50. March 15.

NATURE SERIES.—NEW VOLUME.

FLOWERS, FRUITS, AND Leaves. By Sir John Lubbock, F.R.S., D.C.L., LL.D. With Illustrations. 12mo, $1.25.

Now Ready, with over 200 Illustrations.

CLASS-BOOK OF GEOLOGY. By Archibald Geikie, F.R.S., LL.D., Director-General of the Geological Surveys of the United Kingdom, and Director of the Museum of Practical Geology. With numerous Illustrations. 12mo, $2.60.

JOHNSON'S LIVES OF THE Poets. The Six Chief Lives from: with Macaulay's "Life of Johnson." Edited, with a Preface and Notes, by Matthew Arnold. New and Cheaper Edition. 16mo, $1.25.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

SOPHOCLES. The Plays and Fragments. With Critical Notes, Commentary, and Translation in English Prose. By R. C. Jebb, Doctor of Letters, Cambridge; Hon. LL.D., Edinburgh and Harvard; Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow. Part 2. The Œdipus Coloneus. 8vo, $3.50.

PITT PRESS SERIES.—NEW VOLUMES.

VERGIL. GEORGICON, Lib. 1, 2. Edited with English Notes by A. Sidgwick, M.A. 16mo, 55 cents.

THIERRY. LETTRES SUR l'Histoire de France (xiii-xxiv). Edited by G. Masson, B.A., and G. W. Prothero, M.A. 16mo, 70 cents.

CLARENDON PRESS SERIES.—New Volumes.

OVID. TRISTIA, Book I. The Text revised, with an Introduction and Notes, by S. G. Owen, B.A., Classical Lecturer at the Owens College, Manchester. 16mo, 90 cents.

HINTS AND HELPS FOR ELE- giac Elegiacs. By H. Lee-Warner, M.A. 16mo, 90 cents.

TRIGONOMETRY FOR BEGIN- ners, as far as the Solution of Triangles. By the Rev. J. B. Lock, M.A. 16mo, 75 cents.

MACMILLAN & CO.,

New York, 112 Fourth Avenue.

BALZAC IN ENGLISH

Messrs. Roberts Brothers have reason to be pleased with the reception accorded to their edition of the novels of Balzac, newly translated into English, the first volume being now in its fifth edition and the second volume in its fourth edition. They venture to print the following letters, as specimens of the many voluntary tributes paid to the enterprise, which they are constantly receiving:

"ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA. MESSRS. ROBERTS BROTHERS.—*Gentlemen:* Although a stranger to you personally, I cannot refrain from returning to you the heartfelt thanks always due in courtesy those who have, consciously or not, given extreme pleasure. In the publicaton of 'Père Goriot' you have rendered thousands of readers almost priceless service, and I most earnestly trust that the reception of the effort you have made will be so instantaneous and widespread as to encourage you to place the world of Balzac before those unfortunate enough not to be able to enjoy it in the original. Yours gratefully, F. S. A."

"LEXINGTON, VA. *Dear Sir:* I write to say how much I have enjoyed Messrs. Roberts Brothers' excellent translation of Balzac. They seem to me idiomatic, spirited, and fluent, and I have taken occasion to show my appreciation (in a leading critical journal); they strike me, in their English form, as reproducing faithfully the spirit of the great master. Faithfully yours, JAMES A. HARRISON," Professor in Washington and Lee University.

From the Art Interchange.

"Since the days when Thackeray and Dickens were issuing in numbers those novels which have delighted so many readers, or George Eliot's publishers were able to announce a new novel from her pen, there has been no series of novels given to the public so notable and so well worthy of wide attention, on the part of adult readers, as this translation of Balzac from the press of Roberts Brothers. THE TRANSLATION COULD HARDLY BE IN BETTER HANDS. THE ENGLISH IS DELIGHTFULLY CLEAR AND NERVOUS. Whoever reads these books will know Balzac very well, and it is safe to assume that they will like him very much."

Messrs. ROBERTS BROTHERS' edition of the Novels of Honoré de Balzac, newly translated into English, 12mo, handsomely bound in half morocco, French style, price $1.50 each.

READY:

PÈRE GORIOT. Prefaced with Balzac's own account of his plan of writing the 'Comédie Humaine.'

THE DUCHESSE DE LANGEAIS. With an Episode under the Terror, the Illustrious Gaudissart, A Passion in the Desert, and The Hidden Masterpiece.

THE RISE AND FALL OF CESAR BIROTTEAU.

Nearly Ready—EUGÉNIE GRANDET.

Maud Howe's New Novel,

Atalanta in the South.

A Romance. By Maud Howe, author of 'A Newport Aquarelle' and 'The San Rosario Ranch.' One volume, 16mo, cloth, price, $1.25.

George Meredith's Novels.

The Ordeal of Richard Feverel.

A History of Father and Son. By George Meredith.

The first volume of a new edition of George Meredith's works, to be issued in nine volumes, uniform size, English style, with uncut leaves, 12mo, cloth, price, $2.

The following volumes are in press, and will be issued in rapid succession.

Diana of the Crossways.	Evan Harrington.
Emilia in England.	Harry Richmond.
Vittoria.	Rhoda Fleming.
Beauchamp's Career.	The Egoist.

Send for our New Descriptive Catalogue (free). Our books are sold by all booksellers, or they will be mailed, post-paid, by the publishers.

ROBERTS BROTHERS,

3 Somerset St., Boston.

Every School Library

should place on its shelves copies of

AMERICAN ORATIONS, from the Colonial Period to the Present Time. Selected as specimens of eloquence, and with special reference to their value in throwing light upon the more important epochs and issues of American History. Edited with historical introductions and notes by Professor Alex. Johnston of Princeton College. 3 volumes, 16mo. $3.75.

"The best method, in our judgment, to acquire a truly fine style either for the pen or the platform is by reading and re-reading the best specimens of English; and for the orator, whether at the bar, on the platform, or in the pulpit, a careful reading of these volumes will be an admirable education."—*Christian Union, New York.*

BRITISH ORATIONS. A SELEC- tion of the more important and representative Political Addresses of the past two centuries. Edited with introductions and notes by Prest. Charles K. Adams, of Cornell University. 3 volumes, 16mo. $3.75.

"Carefully selected specimens of oratorical eloquence. . . . The volumes contain a rich store of instructive, no less entertaining material."—*Advertiser, Boston.*

PROSE MASTERPIECES FROM THE Modern Essayists, selected with reference to their value in presenting specimens of the methods of thought and the literary style of their several writers, and also for the purpose of putting into convenient shape for direct comparison, the treatment given by different writers to similar subjects. Fourth edition. 3 volumes, 16mo, cloth. $3.75.

For the convenience of classes, the publishers have also issued, under the title of REPRESENTATIVE ESSAYS, in one volume, octavo, cloth, selling at $2, a selection of complete essays, comprising about one-half of the series of prose masterpieces.

"A most admirable collection, which presents not only specimens of the best English style, but the methods of thought and characteristic modes of expression of the several writers."—*Magazine of American History.*

THE STORY OF THE NATIONS. A series of graphic historical studies, intended to present for young readers the stories of the different nations that have attained prominence in history. The subjects of the different volumes will be planned to cover connecting as far as possible consecutive epochs or periods, so that the set, when completed, will present in a comprehensive narrative the chief events in the great 'STORY OF THE NATIONS.' The stories will be printed in large type and in handsome 12mo form. They will be fully illustrated, and furnished with maps and indexes, and will sell at the uniform price of $1.50.

1. THE STORY OF GREECE. By Prof. James A. Harrison.

"His style is simple, yet strikingly graphic and forcible. He must be indeed a very dull and ill-regulated boy whose attention is not riveted by Prof. Harrison's narrative."—*Advertiser, Boston.*

2. THE STORY OF ROME. By Arthur Gilman.

"Will supply a want that has long been felt; they seem to us to meet it in a thoroughly adequate and satisfactory way."—*Christian Union, N. Y.*

3. THE STORY OF THE JEWS. By Prof. James K. Hosmer.

"Prof. Hosmer is to be congratulated on the masterly way in which he has treated his subject. The work appeals to all classes of readers, and the style is attractive to old and young."—*Jewish Messenger, N. Y.*

IV. THE STORY OF CHALDEA. From the earliest time to the rise of Assyria. By Zénaïde A. Ragozin. With 80 illustrations and two maps.

'The Story of Chaldea' deals with the most fascinating of subjects—the dawn of civilization, the beginnings of man's knowledge or imaginings of his own origin, and of his relations with his Creator, the first data for the history of mankind, the causes and times of the separation and migrations of races, the points of contact or parallelism between the narratives and traditions of the Old Testament and the records (now rescued from the tablets in the Mesopotamian Mounds) of the tribes from which the Hebrews separated themselves.

The above will be immediately followed by Germany, by S. Baring Gould. Spain, by E. E. and Susan Hale; Norway, by H. H. Boyesen; Carthage, by Alfred Church; The Saracens, by Arthur Gilman; The Goths, by Henry Bradley, etc., etc.

Full prospectus forwarded on application.

G. P. Putnam's Sons,

NEW YORK AND LONDON.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED